THEOLOGY

VOL. LXII JANUARY, 1959 No. 463

Editorial

PROF. ALAN RICHARDSON is a theologian "whose praise in the gospel is (or deserves to be) in all the churches" on account both of the books which he has written himself and of those which he has edited. His latest work, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (S.C.M. Press, 30s.), will probably be found more serviceable by students and teachers than anything he has previously produced. For here he gathers together and synthesizes many recent developments in the study of the New Testament. To the period in which the documents were submitted to a critical analysis and seemed to be broken up into an incoherent variety of sources, forms and fragments, there has succeeded a period in which theologians are endeavouring boldly to expound New Testament theology as a coherent whole. Dr Richardson says of his own book that "the hypothesis is defended that Jesus himself is the author of the brilliant re-interpretation of the Old Testament scheme of salvation ('Old Testament theology') which is found in the New Testament, and that the events of the life, 'signs', passion and resurrection of Jesus, as attested by the apostolic witness, can account for the 'data' of the New Testament better than any other hypothesis current to-day" (p. 12).

With great thoroughness and detailed references he deals with all the principal themes of New Testament teaching with a view to showing their interconnectedness and their fundamental unity. The outcome is very impressive indeed, and we anticipate that this will be found to be an indispensable text-book by theological students and also that it will have a most refreshing effect on clerical studies. It is not only in its synthesizing character that the book reflects recent tendencies, but also in its emphasis on the Hebraic in contrast to the Hellenistic background of New Testament thought, on the influence of typology, and on the impossibility of presuppositionless study. It is also in line with contemporary fashion that Dr Richardson states his opinions with a definiteness and confidence that were not characteristic of the critical scholars upon whose labours he largely depends though he is not much inclined to extol their virtues.

It is in this connexion that there may be need for some warnings to readers who will take to this book with a natural enthusiasm and sense of gratitude, for it is splendidly, even seductively, written. Calculated as it is to give a new impetus to the study of New Testament theology, Dr Richardson's guidance should not be followed blindly. It is doubtful whether the teaching of the New Testament can really be as unified as he leads one to suppose. As regards christology, for example, warning should be taken from a striking article by Dr R. P. Casey in the current issue of the *Journal of Theo-*

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

62
959

logical Studies (Part 2, 1958) on "The Earliest Christologies", in which he reaches the conclusion that "in christology, as in many other doctrines, there is no such thing as a 'Biblical Theology'. The documents contained in the canonical New Testament represent a variety of theories, some of these having different antecedents and presuppositions. They illustrate scrappily and fragmentarily the development from Jesus' first sense of divine vocation to a vision of the universe of which Christ is the centre" (p. 277). There are points at which Dr Richardson himself seems to offer a similar warning, e.g. with regard to the final judgment: "Perhaps, after all it is an error to try to find coherent and tidy theories where the New Testament is concerned with a mystery so profound that it can be spoken of only in the language of poetry and imagination, which cannot be rationalized without being falsified" (p. 344). But by and large this warning does not weigh upon him too heavily. If we had any influence with him we should propose that he expunge the expression "of course" from his vocabulary for the next five years and indeed from the next edition of this book. With these reservations we strongly recommend *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* to all who can read the New Testament in Greek. Incidentally, it is so reasonably priced that it is that rare phenomenon in these days, a theological bargain.

* * * * *

One thing that stands out in Dr Richardson's book is the easily forgotten fact that the Old Testament was the Bible of the primitive Church. There are naturally available more English translations of the New Testament than of the Old Testament. Jews as well as Christians are concerned with the translation of the latter. The Cambridge University Press has published a new impression of *The Holy Scriptures according to the Masoretic Text* (14s. 6d.), which was originally prepared and issued in 1917 by the Jewish Publications Society of America. Though it was and is described as "a new translation", its style closely resembles that of the Authorized Version and is not to be compared with that of the new translations with which Christians are becoming familiar. The preface to this edition gives a glimpse of the Jewish attitude to translations of the Hebrew Scriptures and to their use in the worship of the synagogue.

* * * * *

Autres temps autres mœurs. "'Short Reasons for Belief in the Divinity of Christ', by a Lady of Title (Cleaver), seems a well-meant little volume; but, though it contains one or two just and shrewd remarks, we must pronounce it a failure on the whole. . . . Our authoress . . . seems to be in the habit of hearing the truth of our most holy faith made matter for discussion. We venture to suggest whether she may not be herself, in some measure, to blame for this? Anyhow, we cannot encourage her, nor indeed any Christian gentlewoman, to stir up the muddy waters of infidelity. It is not work fit even for the most strong-minded and intellectual of that sex, and they are likely to do far more harm than good by attempting it."—*The Christian Remembrancer*, May 1843, pp. 713 f.

Evening Communion in the Church of England in the 19th Century

In 1942 Francis Underhill, Bishop of Bath and Wells, asked the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation to reconsider "the hours of the celebration of the Holy Communion".[1] Experience of a rural diocese had taught him that many people, especially those who worked on farms, were unable to attend morning communions. "The cows", he said, "did not understand a change in their time for milking."[2] His speech was well received at least by his brother bishops, several of whom made suggestions about sections of the community other than farmers who might benefit from evening communion. Evidence also emerged that the practice of evening communion was in some areas ceasing to be a monopoly of churches in the Evangelical tradition.[3] The wider adoption of communion services in the evening, however, was not so much a consequence of this debate as of the example of the Roman Catholic Church which, since the war, has initiated evening masses first on the continent and now in this country, adjusting its rules about fasting accordingly.

The practice of evening communion goes back little more than a century. It may well be asked why it began, which clergy introduced it, for whom were the services originally intended and what form did they take.

One of the two main reasons for the adoption of evening communion was the amazing growth of population in industrial towns during the first part of the 19th century. It is commonplace that between 1800 and 1830 the populations of Manchester, Liverpool and Leeds became two and a half times their former size and those of Sheffield and Birmingham doubled themselves. The other main reason was the great increase of churchgoing and especially of regular attendance at Holy Communion, engendered by the Evangelical and Oxford Revivals. Not only did more people wish to receive Holy Communion, they wished to receive it more frequently. The Evangelical incumbent expected the good layman to communicate at least once a month, the Tractarian at least once a week.

It was not until the 19th century that frequent communion became general amongst churchpeople in England. For at least three centuries before the Reformation the laity were accustomed to receive communion at Easter only. In spite of Cranmer's provision for a celebration on all Sundays and Saints Days, habit died hard, and the prescribed pattern of Mattins, Litany and Holy Communion became that of Mattins, Litany and Ante-Communion except on one Sunday a month. Monthly communion with large numbers of communicants became the norm in the towns in the 16th and early 17th centuries; in the country five or six times a year was normal.

[1] *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1942, pp. 398 ff. [2] Ibid., p. 400.

[3] Though it was about the same time that I was told by a well-known Evangelical preacher that the two marks of an Evangelical parish were the preaching of the doctrine of assurance and the practice of evening communion.

336368

From this standard there was a further decline, accelerated by the sparse provision of Anglican worship in the Commonwealth, so that during the 18th century, though some town parishes maintained a monthly celebration, the average parish had a quarterly celebration.[1] Even as late as 1842 Bishop Blomfield complained that in most country parishes communion was still celebrated only once a quarter.[2]

In the same year a Norfolk rector wrote to the editor of the *Christian Observer*:

> I should be greatly obliged to yourself or any of your correspondents if you will inform me whether it is customary in any part of England or Ireland (or ever has been so) to administer this sacrament in the *evening*, i.e. at the three o'clock service, or at six—and what are the reasons against such a practice. I will only add that the ancient churches, or rather some of them, as Carthage, celebrated the Eucharist both in the evening and the morning; and that although the only reason I have heard alleged against the evening administration, is that it is supposed to be celebrated by the Church *fasting*; yet there is nowhere, to my knowledge, any *order* upon the subject; and, in point of fact, we do NOT celebrate it fasting.
>
> Why therefore should it not be administered in the evening where more convenient (as in small parishes having only one Sunday service), and particularly in the evening before Good Friday?[3]

Unfortunately neither the editor nor his correspondents were able to oblige the Norfolk rector.

The problem of the increase of population led to a vast program of church building, to the introduction by Evangelicals of an evening as well as an afternoon service,[4] and the beginning, by Daniel Wilson of Islington, of an early celebration at 8 a.m. in addition to the morning service.[5] The evening services were an innovation intended for the poorer parishioners, but the whole problem was bedevilled, as Canon Wickham has pointed out,[6] by pews being rented as property by the middle classes and the consequent exclusion of the working classes from church and chapel alike. The question of how to reach the working classes preoccupied church leaders as much in the 1850s as it does in the 1950s. Bishop Tait, after three years as Bishop of London, told the House of Lords that church building was not the answer to the estrangement of the working classes from the Church. "It might be very difficult to lure them in, but at present they were not lured in, but locked out."[7] Tait himself did all that he

---

[1] N. Sykes, *Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century* (1934), pp. 250–1, and W. K. Lowther Clarke, *Eighteenth Century Piety* (1944), p. 11.

[2] Bishop Blomfield's Charge of 1842, quoted in A. Blomfield, *Memoir of Bishop Blomfield* (1863), Vol. II, pp. 35–6.

[3] *Christian Observer*, October, 1842, pp. 599–600.

[4] Michael Hennell, *John Venn and the Clapham Sect* (1958), pp. 117–19.

[5] J. Bateman, *The Life of Daniel Wilson* (1860), Vol. I, p. 266. Bateman does not make it clear whether, because of pressure of numbers, Wilson had weekly celebrations at midday or whether the early celebration was just on "Sacrament Sundays", once a month.

[6] E. R. Wickham, *Church and People in an Industrial City* (1957), especially footnote to pp. 42–4, and R. H. T. Thompson, "The Church and the Proletariat", THEOLOGY, May 1958, pp. 179–84.

[7] R. T. Davidson and W. Benham, *Life of A. C. Tait* (1891), Vol. I., p. 264.

could personally to reach those whom he felt the Church had abandoned, he preached in the open air, at bus stations and railway stations, and in Covent Garden Market. He gave his support to Lord Shaftesbury's Sunday evening services at Exeter Hall and those in theatres. He urged the Dean and Chapter of both Westminster Abbey and St Paul's also to experiment with Sunday evening services.[1] He himself conducted such services in east and north London for "the Working People", insisting "all seats to be perfectly open to all."[2]

Evening communion was another attempt in the big towns to make some provision for members of the working class who either because of work or duty in the home, or because of long habit, would attend a religious service only in the evening. It is significant that it was in two of the rapidly expanding towns, Leeds and Birmingham, that the experiment of evening communion was first carried out. When W. F. Hook became Vicar of Leeds in 1837 he had his church pulled down and a new one built with 2,700 "kneelings",[3] of which the 700 were for the poor. It was a committee of which Hook was chairman which first discussed the possibility of evening communion on 1 September 1851. The committee appointed by the ruridecanal chapter consisted of seven clergy—W. F. Hook, W. Sinclair (St George's), J. D. Dixon (Bramley), E. Jackson (St James's), J. H. F. Kendall (Little Holbeck), H. Short (Kirkstall), and J. Fawcett (St. Mark's, Woodhouse).[4] These were "clergy of all parties".[5] Hook himself was an outspoken High Churchman with Tractarian sympathies and associations; he was responsible for the appointment of most of the others.[6] The committee's terms of reference were "to take into consideration the best means of reclaiming that large portion of the population who are unhappily lost to the Church and religion".[7] Their proposals included week-night services, special services in Advent and Lent, services in the open air "or in a movable building or tent",[8] an authorized hymn book, tract distribution and the promotion of adult education. More revolutionary were the proposals of a permanent diaconate for men still continuing in a secular job and what Dean Stephens describes as "the celebration of Holy Communion at a greater variety of hours".[9] The worthy dean, writing in 1878,

[1] Dean Milman and the Chapter of St Paul's were not enthusiastic and for many years evening services were confined to Advent and Lent. Ibid., pp. 259–60.
[2] Ibid., pp. 260–1.
[3] W. R. W. Stephens, *The Life and Letters of W. F. Hook* (1878), Vol. I, p. 381.
[4] The Ripon Diocesan Register.
[5] *English Churchman*, 1 January 1852.
[6] The patronage of all the churches represented on the committee except one was held either by the Vicar of Leeds or by the Vicarage Trustees, to whom he owed his own appointment. The exception was St George's, which had an Evangelical lay patron. Most of the committee members had recently been appointed by Hook himself.
[7] *English Churchman*, 4 December 1851.
[8] W. R. W. Stephens, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 309.
[9] Ibid.

was not prepared to enlarge on this. He obviously did not wish to bring his father-in-law into disrepute with a section of the Church which by 1878 condemned evening communion out of hand. For further details we must turn to an article in the *English Churchman* (4 December 1851) entitled "The Church and the People".

> Your committee are aware of the strong feeling entertained by many, especially the young, the poor and the infirm, as to the inconvenient and trying length of the Sunday Morning Service; that both physically and mentally it is beyond the capabilities of a large proportion of the community. . . .
>
> It has also been impressed upon them that the comparative paucity of attenders at the administration of the Holy Communion is in considerable degree to be attributed to its celebration at a time of the day when it is most inconvenient to the humbler classes, and effectually prevents the attendance of the wives and mothers amongst our poorest brethren: for it is evident that, where there is no domestic to take charge, the parents cannot leave their children until the hour for their retiring to rest.[1]

Presumably it was envisaged that elder children would look after younger ones. It is of some significance that evening communion was initiated to help working-class mothers as well as their husbands. Much the same point was made in the Convocation debate of 1942.

The editor of the *English Churchman* (in those days a High Church weekly) warmly recommended the new proposals. In subsequent issues he roundly rebuked those of his readers who insisted on fasting communion and held that any duplication of communion services should be in the morning. "We cannot think that this is a matter which should for one moment outweigh the advantage of providing afternoon or evening communion for those who, as a rule, have no opportunity of coming in the morning, let *the hour be what it will*, and there are many such persons."[2] His remarks the following week were even more pointed:

> Some time since we were at issue with them (the postal authorities) in the matter of the Sunday delivery of letters, which we wished to have abolished. They gained their point, and a regulation was made by which the country postmen, or at least most of them, we believe, are released from their Sunday labours in time for afternoon service only. Now then, what are these postmen to do, if they desire to receive Holy Communion? If we were wrong in wishing them to be released from Sunday work, and are wrong again in wishing them to have an opportunity of receiving the Holy Communion in the afternoon or evening, should we be right in saying that the Holy Sacrament is not necessary for them? Where, or what is the alternative, not only for country postmen, but for the day police and for those servants whose employers cannot, or will not, make arrangements for their occasional attendance at the Morning Services of the Church? Can we ask, or expect, all these classes to renounce their employment, and perhaps go into the Union Workhouse? It will not do to *pooh pooh* such questions as these, in which several thousands of persons are involved. Men laying any claim to the character of *practical* Churchmen must deal with facts such as these, and be able to point out a definite, practical, and reasonable remedy. If a remedy can be found we shall rejoice as much as anybody, for nothing but an apparent *necessity* would induce us to give any encouragement to a suggestion which would, to take it on its lowest ground, be a departure from the general practice of the English Church.[3]

[1] *English Churchman*, 4 December 1851.
[2] Ibid., 8 January 1852.
[3] Ibid., 15 June 1852.

As a result of the committee's recommendation Hook introduced evening communion on such holy days and saints' days as did not fall on Sundays.[1] Edward Jackson at St James's was bolder, holding communion services every Sunday evening as well as on saints' days. On saints' days during the week the service consisted of Evensong followed by Holy Communion, the whole taking place between 8 and 9 p.m. On Sundays, Evening Prayer and Sermon ended by 8.30 p.m. (whether it began at 6.30 or 7.0 is not stated), and Holy Communion followed. Jackson justified what he was doing by saying that numbers at evening communion were double that at other times and that his evening congregation included "vagrants, hawkers, reputed thieves, poorest Irish".[2] The evening, he maintained, was the only time to get the poor to communion. Sunday, he held, was the only day a working-man's family could have a comfortable dinner, of which the habitual time was 12 noon, in contrast with the middle-class family, who dined at 1 p.m. and could attend a midday celebration. The working class had tea at 4 or 4.30 p.m., which meant that there was nearly a four-hour fast before evening communion at 8.30 p.m. The remark about fasting suggests that Jackson's churchmanship was similar to Hook's. Jackson had in fact served his diaconate with Hook before being appointed by him to be priest-in-charge of St James in 1846.[3]

The example of Leeds was quickly followed by Birmingham. In 1852, J. C. Miller, Rector of Birmingham and a convinced Evangelical, began afternoon communion in January and evening communion in July. In Birmingham and in other places where the experiment was tried, the clergy found that Jackson was right; evening communion fitted in with the habits of their working-class parishioners. After ten years Miller wrote:

> Our early service was an entire failure—in no measure from prejudice—only from the habits of the population. It suited no class. Most people take an extra rest on Sunday mornings, and servants cannot be spared so early. . . . By so arranging no one of the three congregations is deprived of any part of our Liturgy. Our afternoon and evening people sometimes join in Litany and Communion service as well as evening prayers; and they soon fall into plan.[4]

He also added the number of communicants at St Martin's, Birmingham on 1 January 1860: "Morning early 32, Midday 121, Evening 179." Rowsell of St Peter's, Stepney, reported in the same year:

> Our people dine early at one, get tidy and quiet and get their children to bed; their minds are at ease and this is indeed the Lord's Supper to them.[5]

---

[1] Dr S. C. Carpenter says that "Hook did not continue in the practice of it" (*Church and People*, 1789–1889, p. 371), but he fails to say when Hook desisted or what evidence can be produced to show that he did so desist.

[2] *English Churchman*, 30 August 1860.

[3] E. Jackson was ordained in middle life. He had taken a first in Law at Cambridge in the 1820s. He was ordained deacon in 1845, moved to St James's the following year and stayed there till his death in 1892.

[4] *English Churchman*, 22 November 1860.

[5] Ibid.

He says that there was no step he hesitated so much to take, and which he regretted least. Communicants increased by a quarter or even a third—"all poor".[1]

It is apparent that during its first five years the practice of evening communion was not widely adopted, for in 1856 the editor of the *English Churchman* drew attention to most satisfactory results "in the comparatively few parishes" where evening communion then existed, most of these being "what are termed Evangelical parishes". "We suspect, however, that many 'High Church' clergy are willing and even anxious to follow the example but are waiting for others to lead the way."[2] This is doubtful, for as far back as April 1852 the *Christian Remembrancer* commented:

> We are glad to find Mr Stracey giving no countenance to the unfortunate innovation of an evening celebration of the Eucharist.[3]

When a "High Church" lead came it was in the opposite direction to that desired by the *English Churchman.*

Within the next two or three years it seems that evening communion was widely adopted in London and its neighbourhood. We have evidence from no less a person than Liddon[4] of how extensive the custom had become and that by 1860 it was no longer restricted to Evangelical clergy:

> We invite the attention of our readers to a practice which has only of late appeared among us, but which threatens in some dioceses to become general. To an ancient Christian, Evening Communion would have looked, to say the least, very startling, and even shocking. The practice, in its modern dress, would have violated some of the deepest instincts of Christianity. That such a practice should have arisen upon the horizon of the Church, backed too by episcopal encouragement,[5] would have seemed to the ancients antecedently impossible, or a sure mark of heretical depravity. . . . In 1850 it was feeling its way, here and there, warily and stealthily; in 1860 it is the acknowleged practice of at least fifty churches in the metropolitan diocese. Nor is it only advocated by extreme Low Churchmen. . . . Men who would shrink from Exeter Hall and its grotesque platitudes, and whose sense of decency would keep them out of suburban theatres, have a great opinion, nevertheless, of the superior insight of our day into the needs of the Church, and are glad to have a hand in setting aside prescription for the mere sake of doing so. . . . Others . . . are touched with compassion at the sight of the perishing masses; they contrast the select few who kneel before their altars with the multitudes who might be compelled to come in.[6]

This occurs in an article by Liddon published in the *Christian Remembrancer,* July 1860. Later in the same year Bishop Wilberforce devoted some of his diocesan charge to the same subject. Their

---

[1] *English Churchman,* 22 November 1860.
[2] Ibid., 16 July 1856.
[3] *Christian Remembrancer,* April 1852, p. 508.
[4] Then Vice-Principal of St Edmund Hall, Oxford.
[5] This may refer to Longley of Ripon who approved of the Leeds experiment, or to Tait of London who made no attempt to stop the practice spreading in his diocese.
[6] H. P. Liddon, "Evening Communions contrary to the Teaching and Practice of the Church in all Ages", *Christian Remembrancer,* July 1860, republished as pamphlet by the English Church Union in 1876.

objections to the practice are almost identical. First, it is contrary to the usage of the Church. "When our offices were compiled no Christian man thought of any other time (than the morning) for the celebration of the Holy Communion."[1] Secondly, it desecrates the holy rite making fasting and preparation impossible; the evening, they assert, is the worst time of the day. "Imagine a worthy squire rising from the wine after dinner to attend Holy Communion in his parish church. We forbear to dwell on the picture."[2] Thirdly, evening communion made few demands on self-denial. Newman held that communion demanded self-denial. "Evening communions are a repudiation of that principle, they offer the highest religious privilege divested of any accompanying self-denial or inconvenience: they offer it to surfeited bodies and to wearied and jaded faculties, they offer it to the excitement of an evening meeting, where the activity of the sensuous organs is apt to be mistaken for spiritual keenness."[3] Finally, both maintain that evening communion meets the needs of no section of the community. Bishop Wilberforce avers that his own experience of a large parish leads him to assert this. Further, he says that the practice does not lead to an increase in the number of communicants. Liddon sees that the practical issue is the crucial one, but holds that this is insufficient ground for not submitting "to the ancient tradition of the Church".

With regard to "the ancient tradition of the Church" Liddon was not on as firm ground as he imagined.[4] The real issue, however, was, and is, the practical one. History will probably judge that Jackson of Leeds and Miller of Birmingham had a greater knowledge of the social habits of the working class than Wilberforce with his experience of Alverstoke or Liddon with his knowledge of "worthy squires" and his ignorance of the "perishing masses". Nevertheless, it must be confessed that they were provoked and had some justification for their tirades. A correspondent in *The Guardian* in 1859 drew attention to the following advertisement:

> Aggregate Clerical Meeting for Surrey
> to be held on July 12th and 13th
> in Lambeth dining hall lent by the Primate.
> July 12th—morning service (no celebration)
> Dinner 5.30
> Litany and administration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper
> at 7.30 in Lambeth Church.[5]

A week after the Bishop of Oxford's charge had been published

---

[1] Supplement to *The Guardian*, 21 November 1860, which contains a full summary of Bishop Wilberforce's charge.

[2] H. P. Liddon, op. cit. (1876 pamphlet), p. 26.

[3] Ibid., p. 20.

[4] See P. Dearmer, *The Truth about Fasting, with special reference to Fasting-Communion* (1928), and G. R. Dunstan, "The Fast before Communion", Theology, January and February 1950.

[5] *The Guardian*, 12 July 1859. The letter also refers to the general introduction of evening communion in London and some other dioceses.

another correspondent reproduced the following announcement of a clerical meeting at Hereford:

Dinner 3 o'clock
Clerical Prayer Meeting 5.30
Sermon 7
To be followed by Holy Communion
Dinner each day at three o'clock at the Green Dragon
Tickets 3s. 6d. each.[1]

After the onslaught by Liddon and Wilberforce, few who called themselves High Churchmen countenanced evening communion, but it became increasingly popular in Evangelical parishes, whether to meet any local need or not. By 1881 Balleine says that it was "recognized and expected in every Evangelical parish".[2] However, there were exceptions. When Farrar was appointed Dean of Canterbury he invited all the young people whom he had prepared for confirmation to communicate with him after Evening Prayer on his last Sunday evening at St Margaret's, Westminster: nearly six hundred attended.[3]

Meanwhile the controversy went on. A. R. Ashwell (Wilberforce's biographer), in the *Literary Churchman*[4] of 29 May 1869, and H. T. Kingdon in his book *Fasting Communion* in 1874, write as if Bishop Wilberforce has said the last word on the subject. In 1876 the English Church Union requested permission to republish Liddon's article as a tract. An appendix was supplied by W. Bright to bolster up the patristic evidence for fasting communion, quotations from the Bishop of Oxford's charge were added, together with statistics of communicants of Anglo-Catholic churches in the dioceses of London and Oxford. In the nineties the subject was discussed on two occasions in the Canterbury Convocation,[5] where it received considerably less sympathy than in the subsequent debate of 1942.

The case on the other side did not go by default. In 1866 Dr J. H. Hessey, Headmaster of Merchant Taylors' School, published his Bampton Lectures, *Sunday, its Origin, History and Present Obligation*, with an appendix defending evening communion. In this he counters the patristic arguments of Liddon and Wilberforce, and gives an extensive account of the effect of the practice in the parish of St Martin's, Birmingham, and elsewhere. Between 1874 and 1884 Lord Shaftesbury spoke at least twice on the subject:

[1] Ibid., 28 November 1860.

[2] G. R. Balleine, *A History of the Evangelical Party* (1933 edn), p. 244. I have been unable to trace how early the practice arose of shortening both Evensong and Holy Communion with the resulting hotch-potch of Evensong to the Nunc Dimittis, followed by ante-communion with sermon, then an interval to allow some worshippers to leave while others "stay on" for the rest of the Communion Service. This arrangement is still to be found in many Evangelical churches on the third Sunday in the month, unless they have made the further alteration of having Evening Prayer in its entirety and starting the Communion Service with the Invitation. In some parishes these liturgical gymnastics are being abandoned for a Parish Communion in the evening.

[3] C. H. Smyth, *Church and Parish* (1955), p. 205.

[4] Republished as a tract in 1890.

[5] In 1893 and 1897.

> We must consider what has long been the condition of these people, and have some regard to their wants, habits, customs and feelings, and we must remember the vast numbers of them, especially the women, have not a moment's leisure from domestic duties till the evening, and the rectors and vicars of large parishes tell me that, for one poor man or woman who has attended morning Communion, fourteen or fifteen have attended evening Communion; and it is the testimony of those who have witnessed such scenes, that it is quite refreshing to observe the earnest, humble and devout manner in which these poor creatures assemble round the table of their blessed Lord.

And again:

> The people are calling out for the Lord's Supper in the Mission Rooms. Now, if it were given out by a large body of the ministers of the Church that they would administer the Communion in the evening, many of the poor with whom we have to deal would be likely to attend; but if it is given out that the ministers of the Church of England will never consider their conveniences and necessities, they will certainly stay away from the churches altogether.
>
> And how, I ask you, in such a refusal can the Church of England call herself the "Church of the people".[1]

Here, surely, is the heart of the matter. A Church that sets out to provide for the universal needs of its members must adjust itself to the habits and working hours of every section of the community, otherwise it will lose touch with them. Was it really wrong for the Victorian factory worker to have a "lie-in" on Sunday mornings after a five-and-a-half-day week with long hours? Those who knew him best did not condemn him. To-day, with shorter working weeks and a new host of problems set in a different pattern of society, we need to think out afresh the question of evening communion, bearing in mind the experience of the 1850s.

MICHAEL HENNELL.

Original Sin

THE Christian doctrine of Original Sin cannot be made acceptable so long as it is unintelligible; and it cannot be made intelligible so long as the word "original" is taken, not merely as qualifying the word "sin", but as imposing upon it a meaning inconsistent with the sense in which that word is used when not so qualified. Unless the meaning of Original Sin is specifiable in terms of the general concept of Sin, it must be illegitimate to speak of original *sin* at all, and there can be no excuse for causing the confusion which must result from doing so. If then a doctrine of Original Sin is to be upheld, it is necessary to find a meaning for the word Sin which will be consistent with that doctrine when rightly formulated.

Here we must first observe that Sin is a theological term, and cannot be defined as though it were not. The concern of ethics is with the behaviour of men as men. You do not have to be a Christian or even a theist to believe that there is a difference between

[1] E. Hodder, *The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury* (abridged edition 1887), p. 743.

right and wrong which is not merely a matter of custom or preference, that human beings are at least to a certain extent capable both of seeing the difference and of controlling their actions accordingly, and that actions which are known or could have been known by the agent to be wrong are culpable. The concern of theology, on the other hand, is with the behaviour of men in relation to God; and the concern of Christian theology is with the behaviour of men considered in relation to the God who is revealed in Christ—considered, that is, as called to be and to live as children of the Father in heaven.

If then Sin is admitted to be a theological term, it cannot be defined without reference to the personal relationship between man and God. Yet this is what some theologians have attempted to do. F. R. Tennant, for example, proposed to define the concept of Sin as "transgression of an ethical law, or deficiency from a moral standard, displayed by a person who is at the time a moral subject relatively to the particular law or standard in question"—or, more simply, as "transgression of a moral law by an agent who at the time is in a position to know the content of the law and that it is binding on himself". These purely ethical definitions are not made more satisfactory by the further statement that Sin is "the refusal of God's claim upon us"; for that claim is said to extend no further than the range of the moral consciousness: we "owe" to God no more than conformity with "the highest ideal that at the time is accessible to us". God, in other words, means in this connexion nothing more absolute than the moral conscience of the individual; and since we cannot penetrate the consciences of other men, the only actions that we can ever know to be sins are our own.[1] A view practically equivalent to Tennant's, though more incautiously expressed, was taken by N. P. Williams in his Bampton Lectures on the *Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin*. "The word sin", he declared, "either means a conscious act carried out with full purpose and deliberation in defiance of a known law of God, or it means nothing at all." In this extraordinary statement, the "known law of God" can only mean a law known and recognized as such by the agent. What is being asserted is that to apply the word sin to such an action as that of Shaw's Inquisitor, when he condemns Joan to the stake, is to talk nonsense. It is not surprising that Williams should have been disposed to think it "a fact of which we can be certain" that "historical Christianity as such is not committed to the assertion that 'original sin', so called, is sin in the strict sense of the term"—and that he should have been prepared to identify this sin which is no sin with an inherited weakness of the herd-instinct.[2]

Let us then propose, for the sake of argument, a properly theological definition of Sin. Sin, we will say, is resistance to the Spirit of God—what the Bible calls "grieving the Spirit". And since the only beings whom we know to be capable of resisting the Spirit are human

[1] See F. R. Tennant, *The Concept of Sin* (1912), pp. 88, 101, 118 ff.
[2] See N. P. Williams, op. cit. (1922), pp. 457, 476 ff.

beings, we can add that it is resistance to the Spirit in the lives of men.

The seat or *locus* of this resistance must be looked for at the point of contact between the divine Spirit and the human—what the Bible calls the "heart" of man, the central spring of personal activity. Plainly, we have no right to dogmatize about the extent or the strength of this resistance, to say that every human heart is always and altogether opposed to the influence of the Spirit. What every-day experience does justify us in believing is that the presence of resistance, more or less obstinate, more or less constant or frequent, is the rule, and the complete absence of resistance, total and unvarying possession by the loving Spirit of God, is (if not impossible) at least in the last degree exceptional.

What the Bible calls "sins" are the concrete forms, of commission or omission, in which the presence of resistance manifests itself in outward behaviour or inward disposition. In general, no doubt, the tree is known by its fruits. But the parable cannot be pressed to an actual dichotomy between good trees and bad; for most of us are neither very good nor very bad, and the thoughts and actions of any one of us are seldom either all good or all bad. Still, there can be no bad action that is not the fruit of resistance to the Spirit in the heart; and it is that resistance that makes the man a sinner—unloving to his neighbour because his heart is hardened against the love of God. If it were true that no man is a sinner unless the resistance of his heart is conscious and deliberate, and no act a sin that does not come of such conscious and deliberate resistance, we should have to allow that some of the most appalling crimes that men have committed were not sins, nor their perpetrators sinners because of them. No *a priori* principles of humanist ethics should make us hesitate to say that the man who so acts as to violate the law of love is God's enemy in the action—*whether he knows it or not.* If not to know what we do acquits us of sinning, the crucifiers of Christ had no need of his prayer for their forgiveness.

But we can and must go a step further. The Christian doctrine of Sin has from the beginning been stated in categories which are largely those of human jurisprudence. The most important of these categories are responsibility, guilt, and punishment. A man is presumed responsible for the breach of a law which he knew or should have known. Responsibility justly presumed incurs guilt, and guilt carries with it liability to punishment. (It should be noted that "guilt" here neither means nor necessarily involves the *feeling* of guilt, whether that feeling is dominated by the fear of punishment or by the self-condemnation which is now said to be the cause in its repressed condition of so much mental disease.) The Bible, indeed, so constantly depicts the situation of men before God as that of guilty law-breakers before a judge of inflexible justice, that it has been difficult for Christians to realize the extent to which these juridical categories were transformed by the teaching of Christ and of the Apostle who understood him best—or rather by the revelation of God in Christ as apprehended by the first and greatest of

Christian theologians. No criminal pleading guilty can address his judge with the words: "Against thee only have I sinned." But that is just what the sinner must say when he falls before the Cross; for his guilt is not to have broken a law but to have rejected love. And the only atonement for sin is not punishment but forgiveness, for which there can be no place on the judgment-seat: the one thing that a just judge can never do is to "justify the wicked".[1]

The displacement of Law by the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ renders obsolete all account of Sin conceived in terms of pure ethics. But even more important for our present purpose is the change that has come about in our understanding of human responsibility. For the practical purposes of legal justice, a man is taken, in default of evidence to the contrary, to be the sole author of his own actions, and to have been able to act otherwise if he had chosen to do so. But we now see that the naively indeterminist notion of human freedom which underlies this rough and ready assumption is quite unrealistic. The behaviour of any man in any circumstances, and not least his ethical behaviour, is determined, within limits which we cannot map with any exactitude, by heredity, nurture, and environment. We say of So-and-so that being the man he was he *could* not have acted otherwise than as he did. But "the man he was" is the product, not only of a series of earlier actions building up a recognizable pattern of conduct, but of a system of inherited tendencies, the play of which has been exposed from birth to the influence of a great variety of external circumstances beyond the agent's control. Birth, physical constitution, family, school, social class, trade or professional circle, have all contributed to make the man, and all have had their share in the formation of habits and of the character that has developed from them.

Yet this does not mean that any man (not suffering from extreme pathological disability) may disown his actions either in a court of law or on his knees before God. However complex may have been the factors by which my action was conditioned, it was *I* that acted. The body which is my instrument of activity has constantly been recruited with material absorbed from the outside world, but it is always *my* body; and similarly "the man I am", however much he owes to his parents and his friends, is never anyone else but *Me*, and his actions from first to last are the actions of no one and nothing but Myself. Neither freedom nor responsibility has lost its meaning; but freedom is exercised in a frame that is given, and responsibility is limited by the limitations upon freedom. The element of the given is what Paul Tillich calls the "destiny" of the individual,[2] and the destiny of no two individuals will be identical: for one it may be happier than the common run, for another unhappier; one may have great advantages, another great handicaps. So I can neither claim for my own Ego all the credit for my achievements, nor charge my neighbour's with all the blame for his failures.

[1] Exod. 23. 7; Rom. 4. 5.

[2] See Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, I, pp. 201 ff.

This, to be sure, is fairly commonplace. But if it is true, it must affect our understanding of Sin. For in all our actions both freedom and "destiny" are involved: at any moment I am at the same time what my destiny has made me and what in the exercise of personal freedom I am making myself. The quality of the moral life is decided by the way that freedom deals with the given destiny. But if sin is resistance to the will of God, it seems impossible to *confine* the field of that resistance to the operation of personal freedom. The resistance is present already in the many-threaded web by which the individual is bound up with the society in which he is placed, and ultimately with the species to which he belongs. Of course, there is much that is good in our common humanity; and one might conceivably hold that even the extremes of wickedness in the individual are but perversions of what is essentially good. But one can hardly contemplate the apparently incorrigible self-righteousness, the shameless Pharisaism which is exhibited in the *collective* behaviour of every human group—social, political, national, or ecclesiastical—without being compelled to acknowledge that in human nature as we see it there is a hard core which everywhere opposes itself to the Spirit's persuasion.

It is this deep-rooted unity of mankind in sin with which, according to the most probable interpretation, St Paul is concerned in the one New Testament passage upon which the doctrine of Original Sin has been rested. St Paul's purpose in Rom. 5 is to throw light upon the mystery of men's reconciliation to God in Christ—the way in which it is given to the "many" through union with the "one" Christ to be made partakers of his righteousness—by the contrasted mystery of man's alienation from God "in Adam". It is an expansion of the contrast drawn in 1 Cor. 15, 22: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Over against the old unity of mankind in the "body of sin" is set the new unity in the Body of Christ. Particular stress upon physical heredity as constitutive of the unity in Adam would have damaged rather than supported the analogy with unity in Christ; and no such stress is laid in the passage in Romans. It was the need to give a rational account of the Church's later practice of infant baptism "for the washing away of sin", which led to the belief that St Paul was here not only expounding the fact of mankind's corporate sinfulness, but offering an explanation of it. For physical heredity, though it is not the only factor determining the character of the individual, is the only one that can be held accountable for the condition of the new-born child. If the child needs cleansing from sin, the sinful defilement must have been transmitted to it through its parents; and then sin appears as an inalienable inheritance, bequeathed to the race by its progenitor, the first man who was also the first sinner.

We no longer read the third chapter of Genesis as an historical account of how "sin entered into the world, and death by sin".[1] The story of Adam's transgression does not explain *why* mankind is

[1] Rom. 5. 12.

sinful. It tells with relentless realism what sin *is*—resistance to God provoked into activity by man's desire to use his God-given freedom to win emancipation from God, and by his vain illusion that real freedom and the full enjoyment of life are to be found in that emancipation. *De te fabula narratur.* The story challenges us, first to recognize in Adam's sin the sin of all mankind, and then to see *ourselves* "in Adam", to confess that the sin of mankind is *our* sin, that we may not because we cannot contract out of our humanity or disclaim our share of responsibility for the sins of others. It was the very fullness of Christ's humanity that enabled him—indeed compelled him—to bear the sins of the whole world. And, as St Paul says, we must die with Christ if we are to rise with him to newness of life: we must know the weight of sin's burden before we can understand how Grace and Grace only can remove it from our shoulders.

The actual phrase *peccatum originale* was first used of the supposedly historical transgression of Adam; and its application to the sinful state of humanity was justified by the belief that all men share in Adam's sin by natural inheritance. In the doctrine of the Western Church which we associate with St Augustine, this primal sin was Adam's "Fall" from the state of original and perfect righteousness in which he was believed to have been created. It was supposed that the goodness of God's creation, which is a fundamental tenet of Hebrew-Christian theism, necessarily implies that man as created was wholly good. But it was also assumed (by a literalistic interpretation of Gen. 2. 1–3, unrevised in the light of John 5. 17) that the creative work of God was finally completed and man therefore made perfect *before* the act of disobedience—so that man can never lay his sin to the charge of his Maker. We can no longer think of God's creation as a once-for-all-event, or of the elements of the universe as thrown into existence "in the beginning" and left to themselves to develop in accordance with a given system of natural law. We find ourselves compelled to see the hand of the great Artist continually at work upon a picture as yet unfinished. But if creation be a perpetual process, then no wilful departure from a primitive state by the first man could serve us for a theodicy or relieve the Creator from responsibility for the evil brought into the world by sin. This consideration, indeed, seems to have led Tillich to abandon in effect the traditional dogma of the goodness of creation, and to maintain that creation and the Fall coincide. This means that the Fall is a "trans-historical", "supra-temporal" event: estrangement from God has marked *all* existence, pre-human as well as human, from the beginning.[1]

We shall probably feel that this is to explain *obscurum per obscurius.* No doubt it is true that we as men are linked not only to our parents and ancestors, and not only to the whole world of living things upon the earth, but to the physico-chemical constitution of the universe. *All* that has been before us has gone to the making of our "destiny" into what it is. But the problem of natural evil is

[1] See Tillich, *Systematic Theology,* II, pp. 45 ff.

solved at too dear a price, if sin is to be carried back to the indeterminacy now detected in the atom. If man is made in the image of God, he is more than a member of the natural world; and if the making of man in God's image has required a gradual elevation of the species from the animal level to the human by the processes of evolution, then what we call the Fall must in some sense belong to history. For the personal life in which man becomes capable of response to the love of God can only begin when he has reached the point of self-consciousness and ability to choose his ends. We cannot speak of resistance to God where response is impossible. Sin, then, must have had a beginning in time—likely enough, a beginning in the heart of some one man. But the Fall was the fall of man as man, and for all we know it may have coincided historically with the most decisive step in the *rise* of man out of brute existence. *Extolli iam deici est*, said Augustine: to be exalted in one's own eyes is already to be cast down. Pride does not go before the Fall: it *is* the Fall. All that we need to know, however, is that what happened to the race in its infancy happens to each one of us in our own.

JOHN BURNABY.

Letter from South Africa

WHAT I am going to write about is not one of those new things that are always supposed to be coming out of Africa. It is the problem of the preaching of the gospel by people from one culture to people in another. How is it to be done; how far can it be done at all? It is a very old problem. For the Church of the Province of South Africa the problem began as the Church was born. We are told that birth is a traumatic experience, and for the Province the trauma was the schism of the Colenso controversy. The first round in that controversy, long before Colenso was accused of being a Zwinglian, an Arian, or a "Higher Critic", concerned this very issue. As a liberal protestant, Colenso was a great believer in the value of all natural religion. He held that the atonement was an entirely objective event. The Zulu was already saved; the Zulu already, in his heart of hearts, knew all about God. One had only to explain that he was saved; one had only to explain to him his own understanding of God. Colenso wished to preserve the whole structure of heathen society. He pleaded for the baptism of polygamists and for the retention of the Zulu name for the Creator. These two practical suggestions turned almost every other missionary in the country against him. There were a few, like the famous Dr Callaway, who differed with Colenso on theological grounds and yet adopted substantially the same approach to the preservation of primitive society, but in those days the Victorian missionary, holding out a pair of trousers as the outward and visible sign of conversion, was not just a figure of fun. To most Victorian missionaries the heathen African was not respectable. The heathen wore no clothes, he married more wives than one, and he

appeared to buy his wives with cattle. So the respectable, humanitarian missionaries adopted what was a fundamentally Calvinist attitude. The whole heathen system must be swept away. Heathen religion could not be a schoolmaster. The power of the chiefs was regarded as one of the principal barriers to the spread of the gospel. The national suicide of the ama-Xhosa was looked upon as a great opportunity for missions, because it had partly destroyed the tribal structure.

This was a hundred years ago, but the problem is still a real and a pressing one. Quite recently a cabinet minister estimated that there are 2,000 sects[1] amongst the African people. Some of these sects seem to have started in lawsuits and in personal ambition. But it is not enough to dismiss the problem lightly on the ground that the Africans are a litigious people. Remembering the tangle of litigation which has surrounded the life of the Province for over a century, one might as well say, "Anglicans are a litigious sect". It is a superficial judgment. There is an underlying cause of trouble which such superficialities will not cure. Dr Bengt Sundkler's analysis of the "emergent churches" amongst the Africans in Natal suggests that the underlying cause is the reappearance of the pattern of Zulu kingship in the sects.[2] It may well be that if the Church tries to destroy the pattern of a culture, the culture may take its revenge by radically altering the pattern of the Church.

The first part of the problem, then, is in anthropology—and the anthropologist is about as important in Africa as the nuclear physicist is for the world at large. It is alarming, therefore, to find that there is very little sympathy between anthropologist and missionary. In a sense this is traditional. University lecturers in anthropology say that very few ordinands and missionaries attend their lectures. It makes them feel that they are regarded as "free-thinkers"—a delightfully old-fashioned view. But the anthropologist tends to treat a primitive culture as though it possessed the fragile, but intrinsic, value of a Ming vase. Anything so revolutionary that it might splinter it, must be dangerous. (There is no such thing, of course, as an "average anthropologist", any more than there is any "average missionary". There seems, though, to be no way of avoiding such generalizations.) The anthropologist has a genuine love for the African peoples, and a desire to see them as little harmed as possible by the impact of Western civilization. The missionary's love is no smaller, but it desires an eternal good for the people, not a temporal one, and this may make the missionary appear sometimes unsympathetic in economic and social matters. If the missionary tends to think of the anthropologist as free-thinking, the anthropologist tends to think of the missionary as a patronizing bigot. Yet many missionaries have learned a great deal from anthropology, and some of the earliest anthropological work on this continent was done by mission-

[1] The term sect is used in this context to distinguish small, local varieties of Christianity from the larger, more settled bodies which are part of a world-wide communion.

[2] *Bantu Prophets in South Africa* (1948).

aries.[1] But the barrier is a real one. If missionaries do not attend anthropologists' lectures, the following quotation suggests that anthropologists do not always want them there.

> It is no accident that the foundation of our knowledge of the Bantu cultures was laid by missionaries and administrators—men like McLean, Charles Brownlee, Callaway, Junod, Edwin Smith and Dale, who found that they could not get on with their jobs without studying the people among whom they were working. Ignorance is inefficient.
>
> So keenly do some anthropologists feel this that they are reluctant to teach people whose values they do not approve. My own revered teacher in African anthropology at Cambridge, Jack Driberg, professed to dislike having intending missionaries at his lectures, on the ground that his teaching would make them what he called "too damned efficient". (This did not prevent him from taking a lot of trouble with people whose values were suspect.)[2]

Supposing that the barrier could be overcome—and there are signs that it may be—the anthropologist ought to be able to help a missionary Church enormously. Cultures, and the transference of things from one culture to another, is his business. The Church ought not to neglect such a science. Unfortunately the Church is often met with a flat *non possumus*. We are not able, we are told, to transfer Christianity to the African people without subjecting the one to an inevitable dilution by syncretism, or the other to destruction at the hands of Western culture. It is basic to all anthropology that a culture is a unit, that religion is firmly integrated into it, and that one cannot make a change in any one part of a people's culture without setting off a chain-reaction which may radically alter other parts of the culture, probably for the worse. This applies not only to religion but to every part of life.[3] Christianity is regarded as an integral part of Western culture. One is told that it cannot be isolated from its context and transferred to African society without destroying a great deal of the primitive culture. The attempt would probably fail absolutely, or else one would find that transplanted Christianity had been modified quite as much by the new culture as the culture had been by Christianity. In other words, the only way to transfer the faith is by a process of syncretism. It is true that "syncretism" has not the horrific associations for the anthropologist that it has for the well-brought-up student of Old Testament prophecy. Syncretism in this context may mean no more than that the shape of the priest's vestments had altered. The real problem is that one has no means of knowing how deep the syncretism will go.

Some anthropologists have, however, issued a "minority report". This school of thought bases its propositions on exactly the same

[1] Notably the classic *Life of a South African Tribe* by H. A. Junod (1927).

[2] Monica Wilson, *Some Possibilities and Limitations of Anthropological Research* (inaugural lecture delivered at Rhodes University, Grahamstown, and published by the university, 1948), pp. 13 f.

[3] Some interesting "case histories" of the changes that take place is to be found in Spicer (Ed.), *Human Problems in Technological Change* (1952), which shows how deep they may go. The relative status of men and women within a society may be completely altered by the introduction of the cart wheel or the axe head.

premiss as the majority: the integrity of a culture. The conclusion it comes to is that one can only transfer Christianity to the primitive societies if one transfers the whole of Western civilization with it. This view may become an accepted one in some circles. It is the view which seems to underlie the University of South Africa's course in Social Anthropology. This university, under whose wing most of the now independent universities in this country first grew up, has become a university without colleges. Since the last of its constituent colleges became independent, some half-dozen years ago, it has become an examining body for "external students"—i.e. part-time students working at home. But the university has retained a teaching staff, responsible for coaching students by correspondence. Each department issues sets of cyclostyled lecture notes. The course in Social Anthropology is becoming more popular among prospective ordinands, and special privileges are given by the university to government servants who wish to take this course. It may be, then, that a group of missionaries and administrators is growing up whose views are, at least partly, formed by this course. And the course seems to assume that the only way one can hope to give Christianity to the primitive African is by giving him the whole tangle of Western civilization. The alternative is syncretism.

The Christian naturally revolts against being presented with such alternatives. The reality of conversions from among primitive peoples seems to be denied or insulted. A universal gospel is not to be preached by a policy of deliberate syncretism. A catholic faith cannot be tied to one culture. One might be prepared to face a period of accidental syncretism—such as our own ancestors no doubt passed through—in the course of transition before a purer and fuller grasp of the faith were reached. But this is very different from deliberately using syncretism to preach the faith. In any case Christianity was once a part and parcel of a Hebrew culture. St Paul was prepared to appeal to the "unknown god" of the heathen—perhaps without any spectacular success. He was prepared to cut Christianity loose from Hebrew culture, with its circumcision and its ritual laws and customs. He would have denied that Greeks must become Jews in order to become Christians. He would also have denied that a Greek could never be more than a partial Christian. Somehow it must be possible to disentangle the gospel from one culture so as to be able to preach it to another. Anthropology ought to be able to tell the Church how to set about it. To say that it will not be easy is to revel in understatement. But neither anthropology nor the Church gains when each is just concerned to say "no" to the other.

Anthropologists can be shown that theology differs from other sciences in that the quantity of its knowledge is not continually growing from year to year. The purpose of theology is not to discover more facts about God, as physics does with the atom. It is to reinterpret the faith once delivered to the saints, in terms of the needs and thought of its own generation. This will seem platitudinous, but it is sometimes worth saying to scholars in other fields who have a fundamentally different approach to their own subject. One

can well understand that one could not introduce the motor car into a primitive society without explaining how the internal combustion engine works. But one can introduce Christianity without requiring that the African should accept and learn the language of Western philosophy. Interpreting the gospel to the heathen is a much more difficult and much more specialized form of what theology is always trying to do. Once make it plain that theology is not like nuclear physics and one makes it plain also that it is not necessary for a primitive people to absorb all the condiments as well as the essential food; they do not have to learn the mathematics so as to be able to understand the physics. In any case, there is a considerable problem in trying to communicate the gospel from the pulpit to the pews of any parish church. The problem in the mission fields is far, far more complex, but it is of the same kind. In both cases the root of the problem is that preacher and congregation are speaking different languages, literally and metaphorically. In the parish church the languages belong to the same group, and share more words, associations and ideas. In the mission field the gap is far wider.

In any case, some anthropologists seem to be suggesting a possible approach to the problem. They say that the only safe way to effect a "culture transference" is to transfer the basic principle, not the language or the forms in which it is clothed, and to transfer it to the community as a whole and not to isolated individuals. Then you may modify but you do not destroy the society. Dr Margaret Mead has published an interesting investigation of the vast, rapid, but comparatively painless changes which are possible within a primitive culture.[1] Admittedly she is dealing with a special case. One suspects also that some anthropologists do not regard Dr Mead as entirely "orthodox". But she does seem to suggest that this is the proper way to set about transferring ideas: pass on the principle, not the wrappings (don't say "Give your children orange juice", find out what there is in the local diet that contains a lot of vitamin C, and encourage parents to give that instead), and pass the principles on to the whole community, not to an individual here or there.

This lands one in the thick of a theological problem. Ought one to aim at individual or tribal conversion? Should one use what points of contact there are? Should one rely at all upon natural religion; or should one preach a Christianity that is entirely revolutionary, stressing not the similarities but the shattering differences? No one needs to be reminded how the theologians differ on this point. On the one extreme are the "neo-orthodox protestants" (the school which came into existence in revolt against the approach that Colenso stood for) and on the other the "catholic" school which approves of natural theology and seeks for the points of contact with a heathen religion. Every shade of opinion moves between these two extremes with the bewildering effect of a kaleidoscope. Just before the war two books were published which illustrate conveniently the two extremes of opinion. One of them is well known—Kraemer's *The Christian*

[1] *New Lives for Old* (1956). N.B. last two chapters.

Message in a Non-Christian World.[1] The view expressed in it needs no further comment or elaboration here, except to say that, for good reasons or bad, it does not seem to receive a sympathetic hearing from the anthropologists. Unless some way can be found to disentangle the essential experiences of the Church, which is the gospel, from Western culture and then reinterpret it in terms of the primitive culture, the Ming vase will be shattered. The "protestant" approach does not solve the problem, but at least it sets it quite starkly before the Church.

The other book is surprisingly little known, considering that it is one of the few serious attempts to use the results of anthropology for the benefit of missions. It is *The Church and Primitive People*, by Father Shropshire, C.R. Since the author had an anthropologist's training as well as a missionary's, one would have assumed that he was the ideal man to solve the problem. Anthropologists in this country, though, have adopted the sociological survey as the proper method for field-work[2] and tend to regard a work of this kind as "old fashioned". Christians are, perhaps, not more likely to be impressed by it. Fr Shropshire disapproves of the Christocentric (in its technical, Barthian sense) preaching of the Gospel.[3] He advocates instead that the missionary seek peripheral elements of Christianity and of African traditional beliefs that can be made to agree. Evangelicals will find him frankly prejudiced, for the points of contact that he would have the missionary emphasize in the first instance are the tribal concept of the chief (catholic priesthood) and the position occupied by the ancestors in tribal religion (the saints). Moreover, every Christian is likely to be perturbed by the fact that Fr Shropshire advocates "parallel segregation"—keeping the African in reserves, permanently isolated from the baneful influences of Western civilization.[4] And that is *apartheid.* Fr Shropshire never uses the word. It had not, in any case, acquired its unpleasant associations in 1938 when the book was written. Admittedly it is *apartheid* at its best. But it remains *apartheid.*

The "catholic" approach seems to provide no easier solution than the "protestant". To suggest that the final answer probably lies somewhere between the two is to lay oneself open to be sneered at as an Anglican compromiser. Wherever the answer lies it is not going to be an easy one. When one tries, from either the "catholic" or the "protestant" point of view, to interpret the essentials of Christianity in terms of a primitive culture, new problems immediately multiply. Quite apart from the continual worry about syncretism there are innumerable practical difficulties. If one were to apply the principle of interpretation to the liturgy, what one would strive to produce is not just a translation but a new rite embodying the same ideas as the original. The policy of the Province is to insist strictly

[1] See also his more recent *Religion and the Christian Faith* (1956).
[2] E.g. M. Wilson, *Keiskammahoek Rural Survey* (1952). N.B. for this context, Vols IV and V.
[3] Op. cit., p. 440 and cp. pp. 341–51.
[4] Ibid., p. 450.

upon exact translation. The advantage of this policy is that it results in one rite for each language—faithfully reflecting the English. If one adopted the other policy, then one would have to cater specially for the "Westernized" African, who would otherwise be forced to choose between a rite in English or a rite expressing primitive ideas which had become entirely foreign to him. Such a multiplicity of rites has in any case the same sort of disadvantages as *apartheid*: it seems to strike at the unity of the Church. If one were framing such a rite and basing it on the traditions of a primitive people, how far is it safe to go? Should we dance part of the liturgy, as the Ethiopian copts are said to do? There is no end to the problem. The arts-and-crafts enthusiasts want to use native bead-work for frontals. Even this has its dangers, for the bead patterns seem to have a meaning of their own, and unless it was carefully handled one might find one was displaying all sorts of unsuitable ideas upon the altar. Syncretism again.

It will be said that all this is a problem for Africa to solve. It is true that it is an African problem. It is true that in some ways Africa is equipped to solve it, for when one lives in a multi-racial society and when one has grown up learning to speak, and sometimes to think in, at least two different languages, one has had a good training for dealing with such problems. It would be good for us to have to deal with it, for we need to develop our schools of theology. Though we can never hope to compete with the giants of Europe and America in "pure" theology, we ought to be devoting what talents we have to the "applied" science. But we need some help. Dr Lyndon Harries has drawn attention to the fact that a chair of African Religions is badly needed.[1] It is. There is only one university in this country, apart from the external courses of the University of South Africa, in which a comprehensive course in Divinity is taught in the English language. The exigencies of the time-table allow three lectures a week, for ten weeks, to be devoted to Comparative Religion. Because most of the students are prospective clergymen, one is required to give special attention to the four religions likely to be encountered on this continent—Islam, Judaism, Hindu religion, and African traditional beliefs. Inevitably the last of these has to be dealt with in broad generalizations, treating it as a unit for comparative purposes. Such generalizations may not be of the least value when applied to the religion of a particular tribe. Plainly, this country needs to take Dr Harries's suggestion seriously.

But we need theologians even more badly to help us systematize the whole complex of problems. The administrators worry about the unity of the Church. Missionaries worry about the problem of communication and about the splinter sects. Teachers of comparative religion worry about what the anthropologists tell them. Teachers of theology worry about trying to persuade future clergymen to acquire a firm grasp of the principles of Christian doctrine. All these problems are related and we need theologians to tell us how to relate them

[1] Theology, October 1957, pp. 308–12.

properly. And theologians are very difficult to get hold of. Who is going to sit in the chair of African Religions? A dignitary of the Province has lately said that while he would deny the statement, "there are no theologians in the Province", he would know what was meant if anyone said it. Until we have people who can be safely called theologians we are not likely to get this problem satisfactorily sorted out. Perhaps theologians would regard this country as an exile from the centre of current thought. It may be, but it has real theological problems of its own.

PETER HINCHLIFF.

Factory Interlude

LAST year I spent a fortnight in an electrical engineering factory. If it were not for the fact that none of the three hundred men and women there are remotely likely to read this, I would not dream of putting pen to paper about my experiences; it would be almost to betray a trust.

They were all so nice, though clearly a bit surprised to see me with my hands dirty. "What's the idea?" said one. "Are you here just to prove you can do it like?" He was quite right in a way, I suppose; but the chief reason was that I wanted to see whether it would be at all possible to be a part-time parson. "Dead easy, I should think," commented one of the men with a laugh; "your life's one long holiday as it is, after all." But most allowed me to have my say: here was England with about the same number of clergy to-day as she had in 1914, whereas the population was half as big again. Was there a case for part-time clergy? Could parish priests be part-time? And/or could there be men who were no drain on the church's finances because they earned a weekly wage at some other job, but who, after evening classes, perhaps for two or three years, could help out at night and at the week-ends? And, I added to my questioners, these men would, by being mixed right up in the ordinary world, be closer to ordinary folk than clergy generally are. This line never failed to provoke interest. "You could never do it; a chap can't hold down two jobs at once." "Sounds a good idea to me." And on one tack or another discussion would begin.

I had wondered very much if people would say, or at least imply: "It's all very well for you to be here for a fortnight; we're here for a living." This is one reason why I stuck throughout to my part-time parson story, and never suggested that I had come just to see what happens in a factory. Looking back I think that was wise; as it was, many of the men said: "How do you like it? Care to do it always?" But I was interested that one almost in the same breath said: "No, of course you wouldn't; you wouldn't use your brains enough." As, at the time, I was minding an electric saw which was cutting me fifty-seven lengths of copper piping and took three hours to do so, while I simply moved the piping along every few minutes, he was dead right; but obviously some jobs in the place did demand a great deal of technical knowledge and skill.

Having heard that I was testing the part-time parson idea, one member of the office staff of the factory stopped at my bench on the last day and asked me whether I now thought the scheme would be workable. My answer was, and is, that for a man with a small parish (say, under a thousand people) I am sure it would be workable and, indeed, be a wonderful thing for both clergy and people. Even in a fortnight I learned a vast amount about working men which I had forgotten from army days of thirteen or fourteen years ago, and had apparently not acquired during eight years in orders. But in a bigger parish you could not do both jobs. With only four thousand people in this place, my ordinary work got badly behindhand, and this at a time (August) when there were no schools open and no parish organizations going. From standing for nine hours (we worked from 8–6 for four days, and 8–5 on Fridays) I was much too physically tired to do all that needed doing at night. I did about two hours' work each evening except Mondays; this included a number of essential visits to ill people, one wedding interview, a session on a new youth club to be launched this winter, a long evening with the treasurer planning a direct-giving scheme, two baptism interviews in the couples' homes, one visit to a family just moved in (on another priest's recommendation), and the preparation of three addresses for each Sunday (three out of the six were old sermons, but needed work done on them). All the above were essentials, with the possible exception of the evening with the treasurer, but he had been away on holiday for three weeks, and this session had to be got in before the next P.C.C. meeting. Put off (and never to be caught up on!) was the small but definite amount of reading which that fortnight would have carried; a lot of correspondence; and a long list of visits arising from 'phone calls, letters or messages which came in to the parsonage during those two weeks.

I do not know whether there are parochial clergy with under a thousand people these days; after so many parishes have been amalgamated I doubt if there are many. Some of these will be men who are contributing to the work of the Church by their writing, or by taking part in overseas affairs; some will be only partially fit. My guess is that the Church of England could produce only a few score of priests in charge of parishes who would be free enough to work five days a week and do an incumbent's job; and even in their case their regular ministry would have to be radically altered. For one thing, I think one carefully prepared sermon a month would be the maximum the congregation could expect. Perhaps that would be a good thing all round!

So much for what I learned on the main theme—the feasibility of part-time parsons. But life in the factory taught me much that I must try to remember. Much of it is summed up in a remark (not addressed to me or meant for me) made in the washing-room at the end of the first week: "Well, there's one gone, anyway." He meant the first week on the way round to the next fortnight's holiday a twelvemonth ahead. These men, typical of thousands, live for their time off: "twenty minutes to tea"; "another hour to lunch"; "forty

minutes to go, we'd better start sweeping up" were phrases overheard daily; and the significant thing is that I got into the way of thinking like that myself in only a fortnight. I am quite sure that this was not only because "the care of all the churches" was pressing in on me (that sounds silly, but it did press in, astonishingly so). I am certain that I have never looked at a clock or watch so much as I did during the working hours of that fortnight; and it is not as though (except for that copper piping day) I was doing repetitive or monotonous work. They moved me round the various shops and I was almost continually doing something. One person—a man with more education than most—put it in a nutshell when he said: "I expect it feels different getting here at 8 and knowing you don't see home again until 6." And I think, too, that the very fact of clocking-in (a wretched time-piece again) has a lot to do with the slavish dependence on time that there is on the factory floor. A charge-hand to whom I said once that normally I was flat out seeing what I could fit into a day, yet here were men all round me longing for time to pass, did not understand what I was getting at at all, and I was glad, because it was a patronizing and unwise thing to say. Tools are downed on the instant of the tea-break hooter, morning and afternoon, some ten minutes before the lunch hooter, and anything up to fifteen or twenty before "no-side" at night; I was gladly doing the same myself before a few days were out.

The factory is in the parish, and I was at an advantage in that, through my often having visited it wearing a dog-collar, people knew who I was. As a result, perhaps, the questions and comments came more readily. Many of them fascinated me. "Are you a mason, padre? I can tell you that if you're not you'll never get on in the Church." "What about these miracles? Who ever heard of a few loaves and fishes (*sic*) feeding 5,000 people, and twelve baskets left over afterwards?" "People go into the church as far as I can see just to gain power for themselves. Look at that Makarios now." "Why don't you get your bishops to organize national lotteries?" "These Mormons won't get anywhere in England, because you have to give up 10 per cent of your income before you can join." Not least, I believe, because I had no axe to grind, and they were well aware of it, the talk flowed on. I met frequently derogatory opinions of the Roman Catholics, and found myself in the unusual position of defending our brothers of that communion. I soon sensed that the men on the floor had no use for the office staff (except on pay day) and thoroughly despised many of their "superior officers" because they were quite sure they could not do the jobs which were done at the bench (army memories floated back on that one). I realized afresh how much non-churchgoers hate the "clink of money round the altar", and cannot see at all that they have a responsibility for the upkeep of the church of which they are baptized members. I saw with my own eyes the enormous power of the pools (little huddles of men, immediately after pay packets had been distributed, disbursing their contributions to the chap who collects the "perm"); and I appreciated as I have never done before what spice that weekly flutter adds to a dull life

("Look, mate, I don't smoke and I don't drink; if I couldn't shout myself hoarse on a Saturday afternoon and do my coupons every week, life wouldn't be worth living"). I understood for the first time how appallingly difficult Christian witness, positive outspoken Christian witness, must be for the layman in that sort of job. (One Baptist I discovered was regarded as a crank because he denounced some of his pals' practices on occasions.)

Humour was never far below the surface; leg-pulling abounded, and things which one would have thought might have palled never failed to raise a laugh (the same three men always got up together from their tea-break bench in an attempt to tip the end man, also always the same, on to the floor). Swearing was almost nil, except from a wild Irish storeman, who was regularly baited to the full repertoire.

Perhaps the best crack, which kept me going through one very long noisy morning, was from a welder in the steel shop who regaled me, while he threw back his shield and waved his stick of weld in the air, with the dramatic account of how he should have "come up" on the pools to the tune of at least £250. "£250," he said; "but do you know what it was? 10s. I knew it wasn't big money as soon as the postman came without a registered. In fact, I was so disgusted that I never even opened it. Threw it across at the wife I did, and said, 'You can keep that, it's no good to me.' " And down went the shield as the weld ran on again.

Needless to say, I asked none of the men to come to church. But now at eight o'clock in the morning, as the church bell rings and the cards get their punch-holes on the clocking-in machines, Matins seems to be peopled in a way it has never been before.

JOHN BICKERSTETH.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Michael Hennell is Vice-Principal of St Aidan's College, Birmingham.

The Rev. John Burnaby is a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and was Regius Professor of Divinity from 1952 to 1958.

Dr Hinchliff is Subwarden of St Paul's College, Grahamstown.

The Rev. John Bickersteth is Minister of the Conventional District of St John's, Hurst Green, Surrey.

CORRESPONDENCE

PSALMS IN WORSHIP

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

May one of your readers say thank you to Prof. Moule for his honest, straight-from-the-shoulder article, "Understandest thou what thou singest?"

I cannot understand the complacency of responsible people in our Church over the failure to make the psalms understood and loved of the people. In a large proportion of our churches in industrial and rural areas, the unintelligible singing of the psalms, due to the incomparable obscurities of the text and the frequent un-Christian sentiments, have become a hindrance to worship. The Roman Church in France, if not in England, has gone right ahead of us in making the psalms once again a part of popular worship.

What we need urgently is:

1. A selection of psalms for Sunday worship. There should be small difficulty in agreeing on the minimum number. Disagreement would begin and increase as one tried to move up to a maximum. (N.B.—There are psalms suitable as lessons which are unsuitable for corporate song.)

2. A severe revision of the Coverdale text, removing obscurities, and deleting verses with un-Christian doctrines and sentiments.

3. An attempt to fit psalm or psalms to the theme of each Sunday in the year (if it has a theme) and to that of the major festivals. Thus, one for the introit to the Eucharist; and one selected with reference to the Lessons. If more consideration could be given to the relating of the Lessons each Sunday to the Collect, Epistle and Gospel, and also the Psalms (and hymns), our services on a Sunday would be less "bit-ty" than they often are. There is no virtue in working mechanically through a selection of the Psalms from one to one hundred and fifty.

Finally, as time presses, why cannot we in the meantime authorize the use of the *Broadcast Psalter* on Sundays? The Church seems to have, as it were, turned a blind eye on this scholarly and sensible piece of work of ten years' standing. It provides a selection of 58 psalms, including nine parts of 119, and six other passages of Scripture as canticles, in addition to the usual canticles. And it is pointed for singing.

Nevertheless, for popular song I still think France has it with Père Gelineau's new type of chant—set to the terse translation of the "Bible de Jerusalem", with refrains to be sung in chorus after each stanza.[1]

Ranmoor Grange,
Sheffield 10.

Yours,
Leslie Sheffield.

UNCHRISTIAN LITURGY

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

The most conformist of us would admit that Mr Williams has a case. In the exuberance of his onslaught on the General Confession

[1] *Twenty-four Psalms and a Canticle arranged for Singing*, published by The Grail, 58 Sloane Street, S.W.1.

he has grossly overstated it. Vehemence is very well, but does he really wish to dismiss the Prayer of Humble Access as "one more self-conscious grovel"?

The usual ground of complaint has not been Cranmer's theological content, but rather his stylistic elaboration: so smoothly and beautifully do we confess our sins that we scarcely seem to have sinned at all. Your contributor seems to connect the elaboration with Cranmer's spiritual hesitancy ("Cranmer never fully believed in God's forgiving love"). Perhaps, in that case, the felicitous cadences might be counted a blessing if they lull the worshipper, veiling from his attention the abhorrent sentiments.

The 1928 alternative would seem tailored to fit Mr Williams's requirements. Does it satisfy him? Few priests show any desire to use it. Is it not sadly lacking in "bite"? It seems to invite the Anselmic "Nondum considerasti . . ." The kindest epithet I recall from the liturgiologists is "undistinguished".

It is a little unfair to pull the Confession away from its neighbours before administering such a drubbing. Is it not as if a critic were to discuss Beethoven's Fifth Symphony without reference to the Finale, treating the Scherzo as the conclusion of the musical statement? The Introductory section is surely a whole, a Gospel in miniature. The Absolution brings that assurance which Mr Williams demands of a liturgy, "that God is with us". And through it we come to the spirit and very letter of his touchstone N.T. passage, saying "Abba, Father".

Having climbed out on the limb of such an assertion, I am, however, prepared to saw halfway through the branch! The Absolution is itself in need of revision—far more so than the Confession.

But even if the above considerations have force they are secondary. Your contributor could rightly say that they do not touch the heart of the matter. For if the whole spirit and atmosphere of the Confession is sub-Christian, then the psychological damage is done in a way that a thousand Absolutions and Pater Nosters cannot undo. Although there are one or two clauses I could bear to see excised, I suggest that the spirit of the whole *is* consonant with Christian experience. This is of course effectively disguised by Mr Williams's extensive use of emotive terms such as "cringing" and "grovelling".

Christian experience, as expressed in worship, begins with the God who is greater than our hearts—"although our heart condemn us". From this point of view the chronological sequence is wrong: Absolution should precede Confession! Ours are the glorious certainties of Romans 8. But the note of Romans 7 persists in our experience (and it is this chapter which more than any other underlies the Confession). We forget at our peril that St Paul is describing his actual predicament, present experience of moral failure and falling short—not just the bad old pre-conversion days. *Simul justus et peccator* (if a second indispensible tag can be forgiven). As in the Epistle, so in the liturgy it is unfortunately necessary to "polarize" the total Christian experience. Cranmer has placed our sense of

having sinned against holy Love and separated ourselves from God in the right context—"Almighty and most merciful Father".

Naturally a General Confession, as a general anything, will miss the centre of the target for worshippers whose needs are as varied as is the tone of the introductory Sentences. A masochist will use it masochistically—which proves only that he is what he is. Mr Williams's chief concern is for the mass of ordinary "healthy people", "good parents and useful citizens". Exposition and elucidation are, of course, needed here to a greater degree than with those who have grown up in a Christian atmosphere. But sooner or later even such righteous people have to learn that they are, despite their solid and indubitable parental and civic virtues—miserable offenders. "O wretched man that I am. . . ." Is the Apostle "cringing" or "grovelling" or just "attitudinizing"?

All guilt not being of the "latent pathological" variety, the ordinary worshipper has sufficient reason to inform the Confessional phrases with meaning. I suggest that, for all his psychological penetration, Mr Williams is making too much fuss.

St Mary's Lowgate Vicarage,
Hull.

Yours sincerely,
D. W. Foster.

CONCERNING CONFIRMATION

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

The Rev. J. H. B. Andrews is surely justified in his plea both for a revised estimate of the Confirmation service in practice and for a re-casting of our preliminary teaching, particularly as to rules and obligations imposed on confirmees.

With regard to the former, perhaps one can hardly censure congregations for sitting during the laying-on of hands where the bishop himself adopts the same posture. No rubric orders a bishop to sit for the administration of any sacrament. Doubtless there was something to be said for it in the days of infrequent Confirmations, attended by swollen numbers and administered by bishops who were almost invariably septuagenarians or even octogenarians. But now that we have younger and more active prelates the traditional method might be resumed with much edification. If the candidates knelt at the altar rails, each having his confirmation godparent standing behind him laying a hand on his shoulder, the faithful laity would be identified with the rite in a solemn and unforgettable experience.

The rubric ordering that "everyone shall have a Godfather, or a Godmother, as a Witness of their Confirmation" points to an intention of furnishing each candidate with a sponsor who shall be beside him throughout the service, helping him in his devotions and supporting him by his presence. But what might thus be a great spiritual gain is frustrated by the modern practice of segregating the candidates and relegating the witnesses to a back seat. If the laity were as closely associated with the candidates as the rubric suggests, it would

obviate the necessity for churchwardens or others to shove, beckon, whisper, nudge and marshal candidates about. The sponsors would go up to the altar with their charges in an orderly and reverent way as at Communion.

One must entirely agree with Mr Andrews that Confirmations have become too large and too "impressive". According to Canon 60, Confirmation was to be a parochial family affair. It orders Confirmation "to be performed in the Bishop's visitation every third year". If we could get back to something approaching this ideal, then the bishop would presumably arrive the previous evening, address our candidates, stay the night with the incumbent, and next morning Confirm (without any interpolations in the service) and give the newly confirmed their First Communion, thus helping to bring back Confirmation as a means of grace for a critical period of life rather than as a profession of faith.

Needham Market Vicarage,
Suffolk.

Yours sincerely,
W. G. Hargrave Thomas.

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Apart from my own lone confirmation, I had never been present at a confirmation in the English Church until I had become accustomed to the ways of a Chinese diocese. After some years in England, I still find it difficult to make my peace with two features of the customary English Confirmation.

In the first place, it is all so impersonal. At no point in the service does the candidate hear his or her own baptismal name. In the Chinese Church the promises are made individually. "X, do you here in the presence of God . . ." This is perhaps impracticable in this country, where we are so concerned that no service should be too long! But it might be possible for the presenting clergy to say at the beginning, "Reverend Father in God, I present unto you John Jones, Mary Smith, etc., that they may receive the gift of the Holy Spirit in the laying-on of hands."

My other worry is the white clad, veiled girl candidates. The "confirmation frock" does seem to be on its way out, to be replaced by school uniform, or guide uniform, which is much sounder, though rarely by an ordinary everyday frock, which is surely theologically soundest of all. But, as far as I know, the confirmation veil is still universal. What is it for? And what does it mean? 1 Cor. 11 is out of fashion, so it is not that they shall be covered. If it is to protect the bishop's hands, it would be better for the boys to wear them! If it is "so that they will all look more or less the same" it seems to me monstrous, because it is just the points at which they are themselves and nobody else, for which we believe God to be calling them; and it is their hair-do's, their frocks, their knowledge that they have made the best of themselves for a great day, which we hope among other things to bring under the power of the Holy Spirit. There is

a practical objection to the veil, too, in that it makes it so difficult to pick out your own particular responsibility. Of course people want to "identify their own children and god-children". If they don't care that much, their prayers are not likely to be very effective. But one overhears agonized whispers, "I think she's two to the right of the girl with the lace veil, but I'm not sure". A lot of spiritual energy is frittered away in the efforts of the congregation to identify, and the efforts of the girls to keep the veils anchored. For every reason, then, can they not be "outed"?

Yours sincerely,
FRANCES WILKINSON.

ST AUGUSTINE'S VICARAGE,
HALIFAX.

ANGLICANISM AND EPISCOPACY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In your September issue you honoured me by publishing a review by the Dean of Winchester of a book of mine in which I had criticized the methods adopted in his book *Old Priest and New Presbyter*. In that review Dr Sykes asserts that the "strategy" of my book was that of "innuendo" and "insinuation". It is true that on a few occasions (examined at length by Dr Sykes) I ventured to borrow a weapon or two from his armoury when I thought their use was justified; and these have clearly found their mark. But I must disclaim the suggestion that I have borrowed his *strategy*: I did not do so for the simple reason that I disapprove of it as a method of scholarship. It is, of course, disappointing that Dr Sykes has chosen to adhere to it in his review, for no one could guess from his account what in fact I undertook to do in my book (though his omission to deal with the substance of my criticism must be understood as an admission of its justice), namely, to show that the evidence quoted in his book demanded the formulation of a *doctrinal* Anglican "norm" of belief about episcopacy as against the merely *historical* one deduced from that evidence by Dr Sykes. Further, Dr Sykes's continued use in his review of unevaluated terms such as "validity" and "necessity" shows that he either has not read or has preferred to overlook the constructive portions of my book, and in particular its second part, where I endeavoured to elucidate the meaning of these and other such ambiguous terms.

Yours faithfully,
A. L. PECK.

CHRIST'S COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.
14 *November* 1958.

PHILLIPS BROOKS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I am writing on behalf of Prof. Raymond W. Albright, who is engaged on a biography of Bishop Phillips Brooks (1835–93), the

famous American Episcopalian preacher and author, who became sixth Bishop of Massachusetts. Prof. Albright is visiting England early this year, but, as his time is limited, he is anxious to locate as many MS sources relating to Bishop Brooks as possible before he leaves the United States. He would be grateful to learn of any letters or MSS referring to Bishop Brooks and to Dean Farrar, Dean Stanley, Dean Milman, Lord Tennyson and other distinguished friends and correspondents in their dealings with the bishop.

I would much appreciate it if such information could be sent to Prof. Albright, care of Miss Skidmore, Macmillan and Co., Ltd, 10 St Martin's Street, London, W.C.2.

I am,
Yours, etc.,
MAURICE MACMILLAN.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE PRESOCRATIC PHILOSOPHERS: A CRITICAL HISTORY WITH A SELECTION OF TEXTS. By G. S. Kirk and J. E. Raven. Cambridge University Press. 55s.

This is an absorbingly interesting and extremely learned book. It is the work of two experts who have long had their nose in the texts which they discuss, and it goes without saying that they have brought a formidable battery of learning to bear upon the problems of interpreting the Presocratics. The book is not indeed addressed to the casual reader who may want to pick up fairly rapidly a smattering of a great subject, and is not recommended for reading in a train. It is a work of masterly erudition which makes stern demands on the reader's concentration. Nevertheless, it is not just one more book by experts to be read only by other experts. There are important concessions to the weaker brethren. All Greek passages (and they are very numerous) are accompanied by a neat translation at the foot of the page, and the more abstruse minutiae have been relegated to small type, so that we are told when we may skip. Accordingly, while the authors have primarily addressed themselves to their colleagues in the specialized study of ancient philosophy, the honey from their hive can also be enjoyed by others more generally concerned with the history of philosophic and scientific ideas. Mr Kirk has written the chapters on the Ionian thinkers and the atomists, while Mr Raven tells us about Pythagoras and the Italian schools.

The story they have to tell could, I suppose, have the sub-title, "The consequences of curiosity". Mr Kirk's introduction begins with a description of the pre-philosophical cosmogonies of mythology, and with plentiful illustrations from Pritchard's *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament* shows the close kinship between Greek theogonies and cosmogonies (Hesiod and Pherecydes) and those of the Babylonians, Egyptians, and Hittites. The first philo-

sopher is reckoned to be Thales. He stands infinitely nearer to the mythological cosmogonies than he does, say, to Heraclitus, not to mention Aristotle. Yet he first began to ask questions about the causes of things, making simple astronomical observations, and seeing an inter-connectedness in things around him. It was the first step towards a materialistic interpretation of the world, and a momentous change. The Italian school shared the Milesian concern for cosmology, but started from abstractions and had a more deeply religious attitude to the world. Mr Raven brings out the paradox in their position: "They end in a corporealism hardly less total, if much more difficult to understand, than that of the Milesians." The story is also one of the gradual transfer of interest from the external world to man in himself, and at the end we stop with Diogenes of Apollonia asking questions about cognition and even anatomy—though even here the interest in man springs from a cosmological inquiry and assumes that there is some parallelism between the human body and the external world. It is left for Socrates to concentrate philosophical inquiry upon ethics.

There is a good short introduction concerning the chief writers who have preserved fragments of the Presocratics. In the second edition the description of "Hippolytus, bishop of Rome" might be qualified.

Christ Church, Oxford. H. Chadwick.

The Lord of History. By Jean Daniélou. Translated by Nigel Abercrombie. Longmans. 30s.

Heaven in the Christian Tradition. By Ulrich Simon. Rockliff. 42s.

Providence. By Roger Hazelton. S.C.M. Press. 15s.

Father Daniélou writes on God's action in both sacred and profane history. He recognizes, with Cullmann, that the decisive event in sacred history is Christ's Resurrection; "the last days have come with Christ's gift of eternal life" (p. 8). However, the Resurrection cannot be separated from (*a*) preceding, and (*b*) succeeding events.

(*a*) Christ fulfils the significance of the saving events that preceded him, and this fulfilment is primarily typological. The relation of type to anti-type "is grounded in the structural unity of God's design: the same divine characteristics are revealed in the successive strata of history" (p. 140). Typological patterns are prolonged into the sacramental life of the Church, as is shown by the symbols of the Banquet and the Vine; the sacraments are "the continuation, into the ecclesiastical era, of the *mirabilia Dei* recorded in the Old and New Testaments" (p. 203).

(*b*) Christ and his Resurrection, therefore, besides consummating the old, also inaugurate the new; the Church continues both the form and the substance of God's redemptive activity in the world. *Heilsgeschichte* proceeds in three stages: "The Old Testament shows us the design of God's mighty works; the New Testament shows us

their definitive execution; the Church exhibits their repercussions" (p. 204). Barth wrongly isolates the Resurrection as a past event. In his view "the final salvation of men flows from this event, solely in proportion to their belief in it: but there is no working out of salvation in the course of historical time. History brings no increment of real value, and consequently no progress: there is really no point in it" (p. 10).

Father Daniélou relates sacred to profane history in terms of dialectical tension. "The Church and temporal society can never enjoy the harmonious relationship of two parallel organizations, where one might be the other's complement and crown. They are two successive periods of history in dramatic conflict" (pp. 16–17). The cultural and political achievements of the secular order are perilously poised. Even when they remain good—even when they are influenced by the Gospel—they are impermanent, for they will vanish when the celestial kingdom has fully come. When they become evil (when they are absolutized by idolatrous and wicked men) they incur God's inexorable judgment on human pride.

This book is a lucid, balanced, and profound treatment of a peculiarly complex theme.

Mr Simon is concerned with the origins, rather than with the development, of Christian tradition. After an introductory survey of the role that "Heaven" occupies in human thought from the time of ancient mythologies to the twentieth century, he deals in chapters 2–8 with the idea of Heaven in the Old and New Testaments and inter-testamental literature according to the following topics: the idea of Heaven and of God as the God of Heaven, the Society of Heaven (the angels), the Enemy of Heaven (Satan), Christ's victory over the evil powers in Heaven, Life in Heaven, and the significance of Heaven for Christian worship.

He amasses a large amount of literary evidence and draws a number of valid conclusions. He stresses (chapter 3) that Yahweh, while a "heavenly" God, transcends Heaven as the Creator of both Heaven and earth; he insists (chapters 5 and 6) that in the Bible "Satan does not belong to a world of metaphor or mythological exaggeration, nor indeed to a pre-historic past" (p. 164), but is a fully real, contemporary figure who holds the world in bondage and who is defeated by Christ's victory on the Cross; he points out that, according to biblical eschatology, since even the heavens are corrupt and since Christ's victory will not be complete until the Parousia, "the transformation from the earthly to the heavenly life cannot be completed before the work of Christ and the re-creation of the universe have been achieved" (p. 216); finally, in his closing chapter, he urges that the Church's worship, and particularly the Eucharist, is a participation through the symbols of space and time in the eternal ministry of the exalted Christ.

The biblical documentation is thorough and the exegesis, in the main, sound. It is, I suppose, inevitable that such an extensive collection of (often contradictory) material should leave the reader wondering what he is to believe and in what manner he is to believe

it. However, Mr Simon promises another book in which he will interpret his data "from a modern point of view" (p. viii).

Mr Hazelton, who holds a chair at Pomona College in California, has chosen a subject which, in spite of its importance, has been neglected by recent theologians. He seeks to make the notion of divine providence intelligible to a generation of unbelievers who are haunted by "anxiety"—by the feeling that they are in the grip of an alien "fate" which they can barely understand and certainly cannot change.

In the course of his treatment he makes several valuable points from which I select three.

1. Fatalism to-day is to be distinguished from fatalism in the Graeco-Roman world. "In the great tragic poets of the Periclean Age the whole conception of fate was absorbed and largely neutralized within the growing belief that Zeus, the god of justice, ruled supreme in heaven and over the earth" (p. 42). To-day, however, the notion of fate, or destiny, has become devoid of any rational or moral meaning.

2. Belief in a personal providence is not an abstract dogma; it is a matter of concrete experience. Pp. 52–7 (which are among the best and could well have been expanded) are devoted to an analysis of this experience in terms of "being spared", "being sustained", and "being led".

3. The ordering of God's providence, while it is most clearly *known* in retrospect, is *accepted* in the present moment (*kairos*) of decision. It is through such moments that the ever-flowing, ever-changing passage of time (*chronos*) is fulfilled (chapters 4 and 5).

The book is not above criticism. The Christo-centric note struck so firmly in the closing pages hardly dominates the book as a whole; there is no discussion of the Holy Spirit's share in the activity of providence; and there is a strange misinterpretation of Plato on pp. 120–1. Nevertheless, Mr Hazelton says many things that cannot fail to illumine and stimulate.

Bangor. H. P. Owen.

On Selfhood and Godhood. By C. A. Campbell. Allen and Unwin. 35s.

Faith and Logic. Edited by Basil Mitchell. Allen and Unwin. 21s.

These two volumes illustrate, far better than any generalized description could, the difference between traditional Philosophy of Religion and the ways of philosophizing about religious and theological problems which have become current recently. Prof. Campbell, a notable champion of Philosophy and Metaphysics in the Grand Manner, is by no means unaware that his Gifford Lectures will seem to many old fashioned. "Readers of this book will not be long in discovering my inability to do obeisance to the twin gods of so much recent British philosophy . . . empiricism and linguisticism". Indeed not. The names which come most naturally are those of Brad-

ley, Alexander, Bosanquet and Bowman; not Wittgenstein, Wisdom, Austin or Braithwaite. There is no harm in this. Nor can we complain that Prof. Campbell is less than straightforward in his aims. The terms of the Gifford Lectureship direct him to the field of Natural Theology, whose "main business, as I understand it, is to consider how much of certain or probable knowledge is obtainable, on grounds which approve themeslves to reason, concerning the existence of God; and, in the event of an affirmative answer to the question of God's existence, concerning His nature, and His relationship to the world and to the human soul. Formulated in more rough and ready, but not, I think, fundamentally misleading fashion, Natural Theology seeks a rational answer to the question, 'Is religion true?' And, if so, in what precise sense? That is, in fact, the question which will determine the direction of these lectures from start to finish."

These words come in the Prolegomena (p. 5). When his story nears its end (Lecture XIX, p. 383) he writes, "I suggested that the knowledge we possess (if, as I believe, we really do possess it) that the moral order is rooted in objective reality might make a significant contribution towards a philosophical corroboration of the truth of religion, *provided that* we were in a position to interpret this 'moral' knowledge in terms of certain metaphysical propositions about the nature of ultimate reality. . . . I want to show, if I can, that metaphysical inquiry leads us to a view of the general nature of ultimate reality which is at least consistent with, though it is not (and indeed could not be) identical with, what religion means by God; and that when we supplement the knowledge got through metaphysical argument by what we know of reality from the moral argument, we come very substantially nearer to the actual identification of the ultimate reality of philosophy with the God of religion."

In other words, the method of this book begins with the conviction that there is a question, "Is religion true?" and that "moral knowledge" and "metaphysical argument" will in large part enable us to answer it. For, "metaphysical inquiry leads us to a view of the general nature of ultimate reality". Now if it were the case that metaphysical inquiry *did* give us answers about the nature of ultimate reality, then of course Prof. Campbell's conclusions would follow. On this score he has no doubts, and it is just at this point that so many philosophers to-day would feel more hesitant. This same hesitancy makes us wonder about the propriety, or even the meaningfulness, of such questions as "Is religion true?" Of course, Prof. Campbell shows by his qualifying phrases—"rough and ready", etc.—that he senses some difficulties about his project, but he doesn't qualify to the point of dissolution. He has no *ultimate* doubts about the legitimacy of his enterprise.

And perhaps he need have none. But whatever else may be said, this confidence does markedly contrast with, say, the attitude of most of the contributors to *Faith and Logic*. Prof. Campbell is fully prepared for this kind of comment, and over and over again, e.g. in discussions of Theory of Knowledge and "freedom", he says that

people who disagree with his method or his conclusions must simply be guilty of faulty reasoning. (He doesn't, on the whole, impute bad faith.) But in the face of the weight of contemporary opposition to the belief that philosophical speculation gives us new "knowledge" of "the nature of ultimate reality", one feels that to sustain his optimism one would have to make use of a doctrine of Invincible Ignorance and perhaps one of Original Sin as well.

For those who to one degree or other have been contaminated by the kind of scepticism which Prof. Campbell abhors, the chief interest of these lectures will lie not in their over-all argument but in the many useful and illuminating things he has to say by the way. And much that is valuable in the book can stand on its own feet without that particular sort of "justification" which Prof. Campbell elaborates at such great length.

There is some interest, too, in the more precise conclusions of his final lectures and their case for a "Supra-rational" Theism which owes much to Rudolf Otto's analysis of religious experience. It may seem paradoxical that this is where Prof. Campbell's avowal of "Rational Metaphysics" takes him.

One of the unifying factors of *Faith and Logic* is the extreme sensitivity of its contributors to that kind of criticism which Prof. Campbell invites. This book has grown out of the discussions of a group of Christian philosophers and theologians in Oxford who have been meeting together over a number of years. Their special concern has in part been just this particular sort of "sceptical" challenge presented by linguistic-analytic philosophy. (This sense of unity and coherence makes the volume in some ways far more satisfactory than the rather parallel collection, *New Essays in Philosophical Theology,* edited by Flew and MacIntyre.) Since most of the contributors take up a definite Christian position, they have, as it were, more reason to be sensitive than someone like Prof. Campbell, to whom any kind of theological "orthodoxy" would appear to mean little. They begin, for the most part, in step with philosophers who put little trust in the ability of metaphysics to give us information about Ultimate Reality. They would think twice before *asking* a question of the form, "Is religion true?" The separate essays, eight in number, are of unequal length and importance, and one cannot but feel that the laymen involved do rather better than the clergy. Mr Crombie's long discussion, "The Possibility of Theological Statements", is, for example, the most substantial piece in the book. Conclusions are more often tentative than assured. Mr Crombie does say that theological statements are possible; Dr Farrer is convinced that we may speak of Revelation; Mr Lucas and Mr Mitchell find no compelling case against talking of the Soul and the Grace of God. But it is no easy matter to satisfy both the dogmatic theologians and the followers of Wittgenstein. Still, what matters here more than assumed conclusions is sensitivity to problems. And in the end of the day the authors of *Faith and Logic* admirably live up to Prof. Campbell's final words, perhaps more admirably than Prof. Campbell himself: "I should still take comfort from my unshakeable belief that, where the quest

is for truth, it is infinitely better to set sail and sink than never to set sail at all."

Emmanuel College, Cambridge. Howard Root.

H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. Second edition with revised critical apparatus. British and Foreign Bible Society. 8s. 6d.

The Bible Society has published in connexion with its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary (1954) this new edition of the Greek N.T. This now supplants the 1904 edition, upon which it improves in many aspects. The text of the new edition does not greatly differ from the earlier eclectic text based on Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and Weiss—the instances listed by the editor on pp. vii, viii are largely changes of mood in verbs or variants affecting the article. But whereas the 1904 margin listed only variants preferred by one of its three sources, or by the English revisers, there is now given a select critical apparatus referring to the original manuscripts, versions and early quotations.

An introduction of some sixteen pages outlines the scope of the edition and explains its sigla. Greek manuscript evidence is well selected and the most recent evidence included. The Bodmer papyrus of John, for instance, is much exploited and preliminary information on chapters xiv–xxi was provided before the publication of this part of the papyrus. The primary versions are fully used—there is much valuable Coptic material here presented, for which acknowledgement is made to the help of the late Dr P. E. Kahle. The other versions are not so frequently cited—when they are, guidance about the sources would sometimes be helpful (e.g. eth at Matt. 1. 8; geo^{pt} at Gal. 6. 18). Sixty-eight patristic sources are named. It should be noted that Fragmentum faiumense is cited at Mark 14. 28 as p fayum: information where to find this fragment would be a helpful addition. The Eusebian "canones" follow the introduction and the "sectiones" are given in the margin of the gospels.

The text is given without diacritical signs—an advantage to the beginner, who is sometimes perplexed, e.g. by Nestle. Variants are indicated by the customary Latin abbreviations—a praiseworthy conservatism. The editor (Prof. G. D. Kilpatrick of Oxford, much in consultation with Dr Erwin Nestle of the Wurttemberg Bible Society) has selected his material with characteristic acumen. The most important witnesses are given, followed by such sigla as pc (=pauci), pm (=permulti): these do not always give a clear picture of the remaining evidence, but are less misleading than compendious sigla such as "H", "K", which are eschewed. Chief attention is given to substitutions, additions and omissions—few transpositions or variations of tense, etc., are noted; and no one MS' idiosyncrasies are emphasized (contrast D in Nestle). It would be hard to find any reading of prime significance not noted here—and additional material not found in other manual editions is here in good measure: it is good, e.g., to have "d" (Latin side of D) cited as an independent

witness. The present reviewer regrets that more evidence from the various versions of the Diatessaron has not been given, and that what is given is divided under the sigla harm^{arab}, Ephr, and Tat: and also that the Armenian Irenaeus has been neglected at some points (e.g. Matt. 5. 37). More minute points could be found which appear to need revision—but many of these are due to the exigencies of preparing such a "multum in parvo".

The Bible Society has given us a new and valuable tool which takes its place amongst manual editions with Nestle, Merk, Bover, Vogels and Souter: in common with these it is of value to scholar and student, pastor and Bible translator alike. All praise is due to the editor and all his collaborators. It is to be hoped that further editions will appear providing ever more full information on this "essential element in the study of the Holy Scriptures", the text and language of the Greek New Testament.

University of Leeds. J. Neville Birdsall.

SHORTER NOTICES

Political Thought in Medieval Islam. An Introductory Outline. By Erwin I. J. Rosenthal. Cambridge University Press. 35s.

One of the many merits of this important book is that it shows the essential unity of medieval thought in Christian, Jewish and Muslim society. Dante, Maimonides and Averroes were at one in holding that God's laws alone can give man happiness in this world and the next. "The knowledge of God is the fulfilment of rational man's quest for happiness."

The source of Muslim law was the Koran and later traditions about Muhammad's sayings and doings which were codified in the four books of orthodox Sunni schools. (The Shī'a lie outside the scope of the author's study.) At the head stood the ideal figure of the imām or caliph.

Dr Rosenthal shows that the apparent similarity between caliph and pope is misleading. "There was never a struggle, like that between pope and emperor in the Christian West, arising from different theories and their interpretation. There is no rival claim between the divine law of the church and the law of the state because Islam knows only one law." Here the writer might have referred to Arnold's *Caliphate*.

It must be obvious to anyone with the faintest knowledge of Muslim governments that concepts borrowed from Plato and Aristotle are firmly rooted in their political system, and here Dr Rosenthal's study, despite his modest claim to have given but an "introductory outline", breaks new ground and traverses the whole range of political writing from the eighth to the end of the fifteenth century.

In the scope of a short review it is impossible to do justice to a work of great erudition. Here the reader will find a well-documented and authoritative survey and discussion of the evolution of political

thought from Alfarabius to Avicenna, Avempace, and Averroes (to give them their Latin disguises), rounded off with a fascinating discussion of Ibn Khaldun's concept of universal civilization and theory of the state which, as Dr Rosenthal shows, anticipates in many respects the teachings of Machiavelli.

This book is indispensable alike to medievalists and those who would understand the hard core of Muslim society to-day. To those who know no Arabic it is clear and lucid, while the specialist will find all the references that he needs.

CLIFTON HAMPDEN, ABINGDON. ALFRED GUILLAUME.

THE WORK OF A PASTOR. By E. K. Ellis. Mowbrays. 9s. 6d.

This book will interest clergymen by recalling to them teaching received long ago as "Pastoralia"; teaching which has had to be modified to the needs and possibilities of a particular parish. The modifications may be valuable in their setting, but unsuitable to be transferred. The modifications may even be dangerous because they arise from the temperament of the particular clergyman. Canon Ellis covers the field of pastoralia and gives to the reader the experience of thirty-seven years under varied conditions of town parishes. It is difficult to imagine a reader who could read without great benefit. Yet not everyone will deem it a matter of fundamental importance to a plain Communion that "the people should be kneeling when the priest enters, and should continue to kneel throughout the Service, except when they stand for the Gospel and Creed". Does not this make a fetish of kneeling, and therefore tend to make the Gospel and Creed appear less important items in the Service?

H. C. WALLACE.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: J. N. Findlay, *Hegel: A Re-Examination* (35s.).

BEREAN PRESS (BIRMINGHAM): John Foster, *The Preacher's Use of Church History* [Joseph Smith Memorial Lecture] (2s.).

A. AND C. BLACK: Sherman E. Johnson, *Jesus in His Own Times* (12s. 6d.); Austin Farrer, *The Freedom of the Will* (28s.); Carroll E. Simcox, *They Met at Philippi* (9s. 6d.).

BLACKFRIARS PUBLICATIONS: Victor White, O.P., *Holy Teaching: the Idea of Theology according to St Thomas Aquinas* (1s. 6d.).

BLACKWELL: F. W. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter* [new edition: for review, see THEOLOGY, March 1948, pp. 104 ff.] (25s.).

BURNS AND OATES: Daniel-Rops, *What is the Bible?* (7s. 6d.); Hans Urs Von Balthasar, *Science, Religion and Christianity* (18s.); Eugène Joly, *What is Faith?* (7s. 6d.).

GEOFFREY BLES: Jack Clemo, *The Invading Gospel* (10s. 6d.).

CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS: Henry Cook, *What Baptists Stand For* [3rd edition] (10s. 6d.).

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN: *The Mass: Christians around the Altar* (10s. 6d.); Gustave Weigel, S.J., *The Ecumenical Movement* (6s.); Gregory Zilboorg, *Freud and Religion* (6s.).

CHURCH IN WALES PROVINCIAL COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION: Ewart Lewis, *Prayer Book Revision in the Church in Wales* (6s.)

COLLINS: C. A. Coulson, *Science and Christian Belief* [Fontana Books] (2s. 6d.).
EPWORTH PRESS: G. T. Bellhouse, *These are Thy Wonders* (8s. 6d.).
FABER AND FABER: James M. Clark and John V. Skinner (Eds), *Meister Eckhart: Selected Treatises and Sermons* (21s.).
FAITH PRESS: Archimandrite Sofrony, *The Undistorted Image* (18s.); Graham Christie, *Faith for Life* (7s. 6d.); Douglas Carter, *Many Mighty Works* (6s.).
HARPER AND BROTHERS (NEW YORK): H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry* (20s.); H. R. Niebuhr, D. D. Williams and J. M. Gustafson, *The Advancement of Theological Education* (32s.); H. R. Niebuhr and D. D. Williams (Eds), *The Ministry in Historical Perspectives* (40s.).
HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Donald Coggan, Bishop of Bradford, *Stewards of Grace* (10s. 6d.).
LONGMANS: *Sins of the Day* (4s. 6d.).
LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Norman P. Grubb, *The Deep Things of God* (8s. 6d.); W. Nicholls, *Jacob's Ladder* (7s. 6d.); J. Ernest Davey, *The Jesus of St John* (25s.).
METHUEN: A. P. Shepherd, *Marriage was made for Man* (8s. 6d.).
MOWBRAY: R. McL. Wilson, *The Gnostic Problem* (35s.); E. O. Sheild, *At Parish Communion* [The B.C.P. service with commentary: foreword by the Bishop of Knaresborough] (1s. 6d.); Jean Daniélou, *The Presence of God* (5s.); Giovanni Miegge, *Visible and Invisible* (15s.); Dewi Morgan, *Lambeth Speaks* [survey of the Lambeth Conference] (5s.); J. W. C. Wand, *True Lights* [brief biographical sketches of great Christians down the ages] (10s. 6d.).
NELSON: F. Van der Meer and Christine Mohrmann, *Atlas of the Early Christian World* (70s.).
OLIVER AND BOYD: T. F. Torrance, *Consecration and Ordination* [reprint from *Scottish Journal of Theology*] (1s.).
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: R. J. W. Bevan (Ed.), *Steps to Christian Understanding* (15s.); Charles Williams, *The Image of the City* (25s.).
PLON (PARIS): Louis Bouyer, *L'Initiation chrétienne* (630 frs).
ROCKLIFF: H. L. Philp, *Jung and the Problem of Evil* (30s.).
ST ALBERT'S PRESS (AYLESFORD): S. G. A. Luff, *The First Monks and Hermits* (2s.).
ST ANDREW PRESS: William M. Campbell, *The Triumph of Presbyterianism* (25s.).
S.C.M. PRESS: *Light in the Night* (1s.); D. L. Edwards, *Not Angels but Anglicans* (8s. 6d.); Max Thurian, *Confession* [Eng. trans. of the French book reviewed in THEOLOGY, February 1955, p. 80] (10s. 6d.); A. M. Allchin, *The Silent Rebellion* (25s.); L. Malevez, *The Christian Message and Myth* (25s.).
SHEED AND WARD: John Russell, S.J., *Science and Metaphysics* (2s. 6d.); Philip G. Fothergill, *Life and its Origin* (3s. 6d.); Laurence Bright, O.P., *Whitehead's Philosophy of Physics* (2s. 6d.); Dom Gerard Sitwell, O.S.B. (Ed.), *St Odo of Cluny* (16s.).
S.P.C.K.: Alf Corell, *Consummatum Est* (25s.); John G. Williams, *God and the Human Family* [For study groups on the Lambeth Conference Report] (5s.); Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* [Reprint with new preface: reviewed in THEOLOGY, April 1928, pp. 233 f.] (18s. 6d.); J. H. L. Morrell (Ed.), *The Heart of a Priest* (9s. 6d.); J. R. H. Moorman (Ed.), *The Curate of Souls* (9s. 6d.); P. V. Simpson, *Believing is Seeing* (3s. 6d.); Charles Jeffries, *Joseph in Transit* (4s. 6d.); Cedric Astle, *The Beginning of Wisdom* (4s.); Caroline Adams, *Articles of thy Belief* (4s.); W. P. Witcutt, *The Rise and Fall of the Individual* (12s. 6d.); J. E. L. Oulton, *Fundamentals of the Faith* (12s. 6d.); R. V. H. Burne, *Chester Cathedral* (21s.); R. R. Broackes, *Unto the Hills* [a daily service book for junior schools] (7s. 6d.); Paul A. Welsby, *Lancelot Andrewes, 1555–1626* (25s.).
VISION PRESS: Martin Heidegger, *What is Philosophy?* (25s.).
DR WILLIAMS'S TRUST: Dorothy Emmet, *Facts and Obligations* (3s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

INTERNATIONAL SUMMER COURSES

AT

ST. AUGUSTINE'S, CANTERBURY

The Central College of the Anglican Communion

July 6–18 THE CHURCH'S WORSHIP

July 20–Aug. 1 THE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE

Aug. 3–15 CHRISTIANITY IN THE MODERN WORLD

Lecturers: CANON CHARLES RAVEN (Cambridge), MR. LESLIE PAUL (London), PROFESSOR C. W. F. SMITH (U.S.A.), CANON H. BALMFORTH (Exeter), CANON JAMES PUXLEY (Canada), DR. R. P. C. HANSON (Nottingham), CANON C. K. SANSBURY (Warden), DEAN CORWIN ROACH (U.S.A.), CANON A. D. KELLEY (U.S.A.), and the Rev. LEONARD SCHIFF (India).

Full details from:

The Secretary of the Summer Courses, St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, Kent

---

STUDIES IN EUCHARISTIC FAITH AND PRACTICE. General Editor, F. L. Cross, D.D.

3. **THE ORTHODOX LITURGY.** By Austin Oakley, Vicar of St. John's, Notting Hill; Chairman of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association. 4*s.* 6*d.*

A brief but scholarly account of the adjuncts of Orthodox worship, and an explanation of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom and its religious significance. There is a useful appendix describing the Office of Preparation and Thanksgiving for Holy Communion according to the Orthodox Rite, little known to English readers.

4. **THE GALLICAN RITE.** By the late W. S. Porter, sometime Vicar of Colnbrook, Bucks. 6*s.*

The author, a liturgical scholar of exceptional competence, was specially interested in the history of the early Spanish liturgy, and this short book contains much valuable and little known information. There is a very comprehensive bibliography.

THE WORK OF A PASTOR. By E. K. Ellis, Vicar of Boston, Lincs. 9*s.* 6*d.*

Practical advice is offered on every important office of the pastor, including Visiting, Preaching, the Ministry to the Sick and Dying, the Administration of the different Sacraments. It could be of service to most committed to the cure of souls, and of special value to younger men willing to profit by wise and experienced counsel.

'A little book which is both valuable and modest; valuable because it recalls the parish priest to his fundamental duties, modest because its humility becomes a pastor of rich experience.'—*Church Times.*

MOWBRAYS

Studies in the Early British Church

EDITED BY NORA K. CHADWICK

Six studies of the evidence for the nature of the British Church in the West and North of the country, from the age of the Saints to the establishment of the Norman ecclesiastical regime. 45*s. net*

Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge

H. C. PORTER

A study of the English Reformation which takes as a convenient and illuminating focus the conflict of ideas and the doctrinal disputes in the University of Cambridge. 'An important book, written with wit and individuality.' CHRISTOPHER HILL in the SPECTATOR. 52*s.* 6*d. net*

The State and the Church in a Free Society

A. VICTOR MURRAY

In the Hibbert Lectures for 1957, Dr Murray considers the relationship between the State and the Church in the modern civilized world, and gives direct and pointed answers to the questions raised by his reflections. 22*s.* 6*d. net*

From Bossuet to Newman

OWEN CHADWICK

'His essay should prove of the highest value in that re-examination of the relation between theology and history which is one of the pressing needs of our time.' F. W. DILLISTONE in THEOLOGY. 25*s. net*

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS